

VOL. XXXIX, I

Whole No. 153

THE
AMERICAN

APR 8 1918
UNIV. OF MICHIGAN
LIBRARY

JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

BASIL LANNEAU GILDERSLEEVE

HONORARY FRANCIS WHITE PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

AND

CHARLES WILLIAM EMIL MILLER

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

JANUARY, FEBRUARY, MARCH

1918

BALTIMORE: B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, AGENTS

LONDON: ARTHUR F. BIRD

PARIS: ALBERT FONTEMOING

LEIPSIK: F. A. BROCKHAUS

CONTENTS.

I.—Syncretism in the Indo-European Dative. By WALTER PETERSEN,	1
II.—An Epigram of Philodemus and Two Latin Congeners. By G. L. HENRICKSON.	27
III.—Rhetorical Elements in Livy's Direct Speeches. Part II. By H. V. CANTER,	44
IV.—Oaths in the Greek Epistolographers. By F. WARREN WRIGHT,	65
V.—Chaucer's Griselda and Homer's Arete. By ALBERT STANBURROUGH COOK,	75
VI.—New Collation of Parisinus 7900 A for the Epistles of Horace. By M. S. SLAUGHTER,	79
REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES:	81
Leonard's T. Lucretius Carus.—Cummings' The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Works to the Italian Works of Boccaccio.—Bloomfield's An Introduction to the Study of Language.	
REPORTS:	93
Revue de Philologie.—Rivista di Filologia.	
BRIEF MENTION,	99
CORRESPONDENCE,	108
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	112
BOOKS RECEIVED,	115

Open to original communications in all departments of philology, classical, comparative, oriental, modern; condensed reports of current philological work; summaries of chief articles in the leading philological journals of Europe; reviews by specialists, bibliographical lists. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price \$3.00 a year (foreign postage 50 cents), payable to the publisher in advance; single numbers, \$1.00 each. Suitable advertisements will be inserted at the following rates:

	1 TIME.	2 T.	3 T.	4 T.
One page	\$16 00	\$30 00	\$40 00	\$50 00
Half page	8 00	15 00	20 00	25 00
Quarter page	4 00	8 00	12 00	15 00
Eighth page	2 00	4 00	6 00	8 00

SPECIAL NOTICE.—The stock of complete sets of THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY has passed over into the hands of the undersigned. These sets will be sold for the present at the reduced price of \$79, for the thirty-nine volumes, cash to accompany the order. Single volumes, \$3 (foreign postage, 50 cents); single numbers, \$1 each; reprints of articles ten cents each, so far as they can be supplied. Address,

THE JOHN HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.

Published quarterly. Three dollars a year (foreign postage, 50 cents).

The Lord Baltimore Press

BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXIX, I.

WHOLE No. 153.

I.—SYNCRETISM IN THE INDO-EUROPEAN DATIVE.

A consideration of the opposing arguments in the much-discussed question whether the Indo-European dative was a grammatical or local case almost forces upon one the conclusion that decisive reasons for one or the other point of view are not to be found; for otherwise there would be some signs that a final decision is at least appreciably nearer. Instead of that, however, there is no gainsaying the fact that even now the localists as well as the adherents of the grammatical theory are able to confront their opponents with incontrovertible arguments without being able to find convincing support for their own side.

Let us consider first the attempts of the localists to derive all the actually occurring uses of the dative from the comparatively rare local use, as e. g. more recently F. Gustafsson, *De dativo Latino*, Helsingfors, 1904, has done on the basis of the Latin, and E. W. Hopkins, *Transact. Am. Phil. Assoc.* 37. 88 ff., on the basis of the Sanskrit. The method followed is necessarily this, that in the first place local force is sought in a large number of occurrences in which we should not usually suspect it, so that it appears that a by far greater proportion of actually occurring datives are local than we ordinarily think; in the second place, it is shown how the strictly non-local uses like the dative of interest can be derived from the local.

So far as the latter part of the method of proof is concerned, everyone must recognize that it has no validity stand-

ing by itself, but that it must stand or fall with the other arguments of the localists. The very same examples which are used to show how the dative of interest may be derived from the local use, i. e. the dative of direction, can also be used to show how the local uses can be derived from the dative of interest. In any sentence like the Vedic *rayīm dhatta mārtyāya* "give wealth to man" it is as easy to show how an original notion of interest could in this particular context give a suggestion of the direction of the giving, which might later become the dominant one and give rise to the dative of direction,¹ as it is to show how it started from the directive force and allowed the notion of interest to develop secondarily. No matter from which of the many interrelated uses of any inflectional form we may start, it is possible to derive all others from it.

The really important part of the course of reasoning of the localists consequently is that in which they attempt to show that the place idea, i. e. the directive idea, or, according to others, terminative idea, is psychologically so important in such a large number of occurrences that it will appear as *the* characteristic use of the dative, while the others are mere offshoots of the same. But right here misgivings arise. To make plausible the dominance of place ideas in a certain use of the dative it is not enough to show that it is logically possible to read such an idea into a passage. Otherwise it would be proper to find spatial notions in every occurrence of every case when the words in question refer to objects of sense; for the whole world is located in space, but we think of spatial relations only a small part of the time. If e. g. Gustafsson is right in insisting that in a sentence like the Latin *Pl. Specios Menervai donom portat* (CIL. I. 191) the dative has local force because giving or carrying to Minerva implies that the gift was going in her direction, then it would be just as correct to maintain that the genitive case originally meant *place where* because in phrases like *forem cubiculi claudere* "to close the door of the chamber" it is implied that the door is located in the chamber; it would be just as convincing to say that the accusative really designates *place where* in sen-

¹ As Wundt, *Sprachpsych*². 2. 120, puts it, the apparent local uses of the dative would be due to secondary association with a directive case. Similarly Schmalz, *Lat. Gram*⁴. 371.

tences like *quis te verberavit*? "who has flogged you?" because the place of the flogging is the person affected. Not, I repeat, whether one can read the notion of place logically into a passage, but whether it was there psychologically, whether it was actually felt and attended to, that is the question which concerns us.

Now we may admit as without question that there are a number of passages in which local interpretation of the dative is not only possible, but necessary. Examples like the Vedic *yásya kṣáyāya jinvatha āpo janáyathā ca naḥ* "toward whose house (dat.), O waters, ye hurry (us) and cause us to come," *te samudrāyeva síndhavaḥ gíro . . . irate* "toward thee (dat.) as rivers rush toward the sea (dat.) rush our songs," or like the Latin *it clamor caelo* "clamor rises toward the sky," or O. Blg. *šbdžši domovi* 'going to her home', show indisputable datives of direction and cannot easily be interpreted as datives of the indirect object or of interest. We may further agree that these certain examples make it plausible that some of the ambiguous ones like Vedic *havyám no vaha* "bring to us (dat.) the libation" or Lat. *fugitivis servis indunt compedis*¹ "they put chains on the fugitive slaves" were felt as datives of direction. We may even assent to Professor Hopkins when he affirms that a study of the Sanskrit rather than the Classical languages would show how this dative of direction is much more frequent than is ordinarily supposed. Nevertheless, when one considers the fact that all collections which are intended to show the original local nature of the dative are laboriously gathered from overwhelming masses of instances in which the dative cannot have been felt as local, so that even if we grant all the doubtful examples, yet the sum total is only a small fraction of the total occurrences of the dative, and when we consider that of the examples gathered only a very small percentage *must* be taken in the sense claimed for them, we must arrive at the conclusion that even at the very best it is a hopeless task to attempt to prove that place ideas are really an important part of the total body of uses of the case. We may read through a good many pages before striking a single local dative while non-local ones occur every few lines.

¹ Plaut. Men. I. I. 4.

As a matter of fact, however, there is no justification for the assumption that even the majority of doubtful instances was felt locally. We need only ask ourselves how we feel such datives in modern languages in order to see how groundless is the argument that in earlier times we may assume local force for a case if it is logically possible to read it into the same. Sentences like Engl. *pass me the bread, I sent him a letter, he gave her a present, he struck him a blow*, or the German constructions like *sich jemandem nähern, jemandem Schaden zufügen, jemandem etwas geben, nehmen, jemandem den Weg verlegen, jemandem etwas zuteilen, bringen, senden*, all of these and many others are felt by the speakers of the languages without the slightest reference to any spatial relations which might logically be intruded, and unless strong reasons speak against it we must here as otherwise interpret the past in the light of the present.

Nor is the supposition that similar locutions were in the past interpreted locally helped in the slightest by showing that prepositional phrases or the locative or accusative case can sometimes take the place of the dative with no essential change of meaning, as e. g. Plautus uses *ad hostis exuvias dabit* (Epid. I. I. 38) instead of the usual dative with *dare*, or in RV. I. 117. 17 *ākṣī rjṛāçve açvināv adhattam* "ye Açvins bestowed eyes upon Rjṛāçva (loc.)" contrasted with I. 116. 16 *tāsmā akṣī . . . ādhattam* "upon him (dat.) ye bestowed eyes." When two equivalent expressions alternate in this fashion it does not follow that there was no difference felt at all, and even if so, the argument works both ways. From the substitution of the prepositional phrase or locative for the dative we may as well argue the loss of local meaning in the former as its presence in the latter, a point of view which is shown to be historically correct by the Romance datives, which arose from these very prepositional phrases, and yet are today not felt as being more local than the German dative.

Finally, the local origin of the dative case is made highly improbable by two characteristics which have often enough been pointed out by the opponents of the local theory, but which its supporters have either ignored or else treated with slight consideration. It was pointed out by Hübschmann, *Zur Casuslehre* p. 214, and later by Franz Misteli, *Zeitsch. f.*

Völkerpsych. 1886 p. 419, and C. F. W. Mueller, *Glotta* 2. 170, that it would be utterly unintelligible why the dative, if it really were a local case, would not, like the ablative, locative, instrumental, genitive, and accusative, be sometimes used with prepositions;¹ for the same tendency to substitute clearer and more explicit expressions of local relations for the comparatively vague case endings ought to have affected the dative, and all the more so because its local nature was so much more easily obscured than e. g. that of the ablative. It is really amazing that this almost conclusive objection should not have been taken more seriously by the localists. However, the same consideration was shown by them to the objection of Delbrück, *Gr.* 3. 185, that the dative is primarily a personal case, i. e. most words found in the dative designate persons, and it would not be probable that persons would be thought of as the goal of the motion.² While Fay, *Class. Quart.* 5. 190, considers this objection convincing, Brugmann, *Gr.* 2. 2². 474, declares he does not consider this fact an objection against an original local force of the dative, and Bennett, *Syntax of Early Latin* p. 103,³ denies the prevalence of the personal datives, affirming that it was just as much an infinitival case. It would seem, however, that while no one doubts the use of the dative of a large number of non-personal nouns, yet the prominence of the personal datives is a reality,⁴ and since this is much more easily explained by assuming a non-local origin⁵ of the dative, that it is a distinct point against the local theory, unless some one could explain by what forces this condition could have come about secondarily, and this, as far as I know, no one has even attempted.

All in all, then, the local origin of the dative meets with so many insurmountable objections that it would be strange that it could display such vitality, were it not for the fact that its

¹ It is true that rare instances of the dative with prepositions occur e. g. in Lithuanian or Slavic. This, however, does not affect the original nature of the dative, since these were secondary developments of individual languages. Cf. Brugmann, *Gr.* 2. 2². 781 f.

² An examination of one's consciousness in speaking phrases like Engl. 'he sent me a letter' shows how pertinent Delbrueck's objection is.

³ Bennett herein follows Hopkins, *JAOS.* 28. 406.

⁴ H. Peine, *De dativi apud priscos scriptores Latinos usu* p. 7, finds scarcely one twelfth of the datives in early Latin to be non-personal.

⁵ See p. 13.

opponents had nothing to put in its place; for the statement that it was originally a grammatical case, that it designated interest from the beginning, has always justly been challenged by the localists on the ground that no element of language, be it a word or part of a word, could ever have begun with such a vague and abstract meaning. This objection is perhaps most clearly stated by Whitney, A. J. of Phil. 13. 285: "To pronounce a case originally grammatical is simply equivalent to saying that its ultimate character lies beyond our discovery; and the statement might much better have been made in the latter form. For to postulate such a value at the beginning is to deny the whole known history of language, which shows that all forms begin with something material, apprehensible by the senses, palpable (*handgreiflich*). If the intellectual values of terms are anterior to their physical; if the tense and mode uses of *have* and *will* and *would* and their like are the original ones; if *be* began with being an expression of the copula; if the *-dom* of *wisdom* and the *-wise* of *likewise* and the *-head* of *godhead* were derivative suffixes before they were independent nouns—then, and not otherwise, was a case originally grammatical. Such an explanation simply betrays a false philosophy of language." This convincing objection against the assumption of original grammatical cases Brugmann, Gr. 2. 2², 472, also extends to Wundt's "Cases of inner determination" (*Sprachpsych* 3. 2. 84 ff.), which he substituted for the old "grammatical cases."

I do not believe, however, that the localists, because of these valid objections against the interest theory of the dative, have a right to win by default in spite of the extremely great objections to their own. This would only be true if it were absolutely necessary to choose between the two in the form mentioned; but in actual fact it is possible to formulate a primarily non-local theory in such a way as not to run contrary to all the known principles of linguistics and psychology. This article, then, attempts to find such a theory of the dative which neither conflicts with actual usage, as that of the localists, nor with certain linguistic and psychological principles, as the grammatical theory.

To clear the ground it will be necessary first to explain my attitude to Wundt's just mentioned distinction between cases

of inner and outer determination. He considers the former such as express relations which *need* not have as their exponent any change in the form of the word, as opposed to the latter which must necessarily have them. The Nominative, Genitive, Dative, and Accusative are clear enough through the context even when their form is identical, and they are therefore cases of inner determination regardless of whether they actually are characterized formally or not. In criticism of this formulation, however, one might say that if Wundt means by cases of inner determination also those which were so from the beginning, and not merely those which became so secondarily, his division cannot stand against the objection of Whitney and Brugmann that every linguistic element must start from a sensuous concrete use. This objection, however, holds only against those cases which actually began with suffixes, so that one might better say that cases of inner determination are such as actually began without formal characterization, and in that case they are not only something psychologically intelligible, but necessary. As soon as sentences were formed at all it was an absolute necessity that the relations of subject, direct and indirect object, and attributive relationship, now expressed by these four cases, should be conveyed from speaker to hearer—not attended to and expressed, but merely suggested. A collocation like *dog bite man*, representing three uninflected primitive words, would not be a sentence unless it conveyed to the hearer that the dog did the biting and the man was bitten, that the former was subject and the latter object. Moreover, the collocation of these stems could not even fail to awake these necessary associations; for there would be no purpose in collocating these words except to convey such a piece of information. Yet these suggestions are not attached to any linguistic unit, they are something purely syntactical,¹ arising altogether from closely joining these words together. I take it then that any case being originally a case of inner determination was simply an uninflected stem which had no case meaning by itself, but which in the context with other words suggested certain fundamental relations, the perception of which is a necessary prerequisite to forming even the most

¹ This possibility of apparent case-meanings being suggested by mere collocation with other words is vaguely hinted at by Brugmann, *op. cit.* 472.

primitive sentence, and which must therefore have existed long before the cases of outer determination with their suffixes, which according to the localists are the original ones.

Coming back to the Indo-European dative, the thesis I wish to present is that it is a case of inner determination even in this limited sense, i. e. that it was originally a case without ending or any other formal characterization, but secondarily received its endings by association with local cases, and that these local cases then in turn thrust upon the dative certain meanings like that of direction which were originally foreign to it. The dative, therefore, is the result of syncretism between an originally suffixless case of the indirect object and certain local cases from which it borrowed its endings.

That the Indo-European dative originally had no suffix, is not difficult to establish. In the plural it never did have a form of its own, but borrowed it from the ablative. That the converse of this is not true is seen from the fact that the I. E. Dat. Abl. Plur. ended in *-bhios*, *-bhos*, or *-mos*, all of which have in common the last two letters *-os*, which must have been associated with the *-os* of the gen. abl. sing. In the singular again the dative ending *-ai* seems to be the strong form of the *-i* of the locative,¹ so that it is literally true that the dative nowhere has an ending of its own. Moreover, we have remnants of datives which are the pure stem in the pronominal declension, which so often retains primitive characteristics as opposed to the nouns. I am referring to the fact that while all of the accented forms of the personal pronouns of the different I. E. languages vary so much from each other that we may conclude that the Indo-European parent language had not yet developed any such forms,² the enclitic forms on the other hand, which certainly do go back to the parent language,³ generally do service for two or more cases, and

¹ Cf. Hirt, *Handbuch der gr. Laut- und Formenlehre* p. 308.

² Cf., e. g., Meillet, *Introduit* 317.

³ It is not at all necessary to assume, or even probable, that these 'enclitic' forms were always enclitic from the beginning. Much more probably they were the only I. E. forms, and their being retained only when enclitic is due to the lesser importance of distinguishing case-relations for unemphasized elements of speech. That is to say, the development of pronominal forms which differ in form for the dif-

particularly the dative is always without case-suffix. The Skt. *nas*, Acc. Dat. Gen. Pl. of the pronoun of the first person, and *vas*, Acc. Dat. Gen. Pl. of the second person, which are the representatives of I. E. *nōs* and *vōs* in the same functions, certainly are without case suffix, even though their *-s* is probably a plural sign. The corresponding Skt. duals *nau* and *vām*, though the former may have a dual ending, are also not distinguished by any case endings, and yet do service for the same three cases. In the singular again the enclitic forms I. E. **moi*, Skt. *me* Gr. *μοι*, I. E. **toj* Skt. *te* Gr. *τοι* (*σοι*), and I. E. **soj* Prakr. *se* Av. *hē sē* Gr. *οι*, of the first, second, and third persons respectively, function both as genitives and datives; and while they seem to be locatives in origin, yet as far as the dative is concerned, they also show that it need have and originally did have no formal characterization, and the usurpation of the locative form reminds one of the regular nominal dative singular. Turning to the Germanic languages, we find that the pronouns very rarely show any distinction in the dual and plural between dative and accusative. Goth. *ugkis*, O. Icel. *ok(k)r*, and O. Engl. *unc* were dative as well as accusative of the first person dual; Goth. *iqqis*, O. Icel. *yk(k)r*, and O. Engl. *inc* of the second dual; Goth. *uns unsis*, O. Icel. *oss*, and O. Engl. *ús* of the first plural; and Goth. *izwis*, O. Icel. *ypr*, and O. Engl. *éow* of the second plural. The Old High German, on the other hand, did usually distinguish between the two cases,¹ but it was of so little importance to maintain the distinction that the modern German has dropped it again, so that *uns*, *euch*, and *sich* are both dative and accusative. All of this shows how unimportant it is to distinguish formally between the case of the direct and the indirect object, and how plausible it is in the light of the behaviour of the pronouns with their general archaic tendencies, that the nominal dative was also in the beginning a case without formal characterization.

What must have been the earliest functions of this primitive dative without ending has already been indicated by

ferent cases, as it took place in the individual languages, fulfilled a real need only when there was emphasis on the pronouns, whereas the case relations were usually indifferent when unemphasized.

¹ Cf. Braune, Ahd. Gram.² 203.

calling it the case of the indirect object. And the term "indirect object," in order to have a real meaning, must have a relative meaning; it must be taken as being in opposition to a direct object used with it at one and the same time; i. e. it must be a secondary object and not one which stands by itself. It is true that in the historic periods many a verb which takes only one object has the dative, while many others have the accusative, and then we help ourselves by saying that the accusative designates the object which is directly and immediately affected, while the dative is used where the object is only remotely affected,¹ and that is why e. g. verbs of obeying take the dative in most languages, while one like striking, which affects the object physically, takes the accusative. It does not take much testing of the actual facts, however, to see that the dative or accusative is used quite mechanically without feeling a consistent difference. Thus, in the case of verbs of giving, the person to whom a thing is given is very much more immediately affected by it than the one before whom we feel ashamed; in fact, the latter may know nothing of our feeling at all. Nevertheless, the Greek uses *αἰσχύνομαι* with the accusative, i. e. treats it as taking a direct object. Of a large number of such verbs which take the accusative though they do not affect their object at all intimately, I may mention the following: verbs meaning 'to fear', e. g. Skt. *cāy-*, Gr. *φοβεῖσθαι*, Lat. *timere*, Goth. *faúrhtjan* Germ. *fürchten*; 'to know', e. g. Skt. *jñā-*, Gr. *γινώσκειν*, Lat. *noscere*, Goth. *kunnan*, Germ. *kennen*; 'to see', e. g. Skt. *darś-*, Gr. *ὁρᾶν*, Lat. *videre*, Goth. *saihran*, Germ. *sehen*; 'to praise', e. g. Skt. *stu-*, Gr. *αἰνεῖν*, Lat. *laudare*, Goth. *hazjan*, Germ. *loben*. Greek furnishes particularly good examples: *ὀμνύναι τοὺς θεοὺς* 'to swear by the gods', *μένειν τινά*² (Latin *manere aliquem*) 'to wait for one', *φεύγειν τινά* (Lat. *fugere aliquem*) 'to flee from one', *λανθάνειν τινά* 'to escape

¹ So C. F. W. Mueller, loc. cit. 171.

² Brugmann, Gr. Gr.² 379 f., thinks that such accusatives are caused by secondary associations with normal direct objects. No doubt such associations could take place at any and all times; but, on the other hand, it is also true that the attitude of the primitive mind to an abstraction like 'direct object' would not be less vague, but more vague than our own, so that many relations for which we now seek concise expressions were formerly satisfactorily expressed by merely placing an object (with or without case suffix) after the verb.

the notice of one', σιγᾶν, σιωπᾶν τι 'to keep silence about something'.

Contrariwise many verbs which affect the object much more intimately than any of the transitive verbs mentioned take the dative, i. e. have an 'indirect object'. Leaving out of account examples like the dative after verbs of saying or giving, where the person, though very intimately affected, is yet less so than the direct object, and confining myself to instances in which the dative is the only object, I mention the following: verbs meaning 'to help, assist', e. g. Skt. *çak-*, Gr. ἀρῆγειν, Lat. *opitulari*, O. H. G. *helfan*; 'to serve', e. g. Skt. *çam-*, Av. *vid-*, Gr. ὑπηρετεῖν, Lat. *servire*, O. H. G. *thionôn*, O. Blg. *služiti*; 'to rule over', e. g. Gr. ἡγεῖσθαι, Lat. *moderari*, *imperare*, Goth. *waldan*, O. Blg. *ustojati*. Gothic¹ has particularly good instances; e. g. *biniman* 'to steal', *fraliusan drakmin* 'to lose a drachma', *galūkan haúrdai* 'to close the door', *usqiman* 'to kill', *uswairpan* 'to throw out'.

Particularly instructive in this respect is the fact that different languages or synonyms of the same language so often differ, so that one has the dative where the other uses the accusative. Of the verbs meaning 'to follow' the Skt. *sac-*, Lat. *sequere*, and Goth. *laistjan* take the accusative, while Gr. ἑπεσθαι² and Germ. *folgen* are followed by the dative. Verbs of speaking almost everywhere use only the dative of the person spoken to, yet the Sanskrit sometimes has the accusative, e. g. *tām devā abruvan* 'the gods spoke to him'. In the Gothic we find *gaumida mann blindamma* 'he saw a blind man' and *hausjan waúrdaim* 'to hear the words' with datives as opposed to the usual accusatives with words meaning 'to see' and 'to hear'. In fact almost any of the words mentioned above as taking a dative which affects the object immediately will serve as examples: Gr. ὠφελεῖν and Lat. *iuvare* 'to help', Gr. θεραπεύειν and Lat. *colere* in the meaning 'to serve', Gr. ἄγειν, Lat. *agere*, and Germ. *führen* 'to lead' all

¹ While Germanic examples on the whole are less satisfactory, because of the syncretism of the dative with ablative, locative, and instrumental, it seems probable that the examples here mentioned are true datives.

² Since Skt. *sac-* occasionally takes the instrumental instead of the accusative, we may suspect that the dative with ἑπομαι and *folgen* partially goes back to the same case.

take accusatives, though they are synonyms of the words quoted above as taking the dative. Contrast also Latin *iubere* (acc.) and *imperare* (dat.) 'to order', Engl. *hear* and *listen to*, *address* and *speak to*, *obey* and *yield to*. Then again one and the same language varies between the dative and accusative for the very same words, so e. g. Skt. *gā-* 'to sing' and *stu-*¹ 'to praise' may put the god who is honored in either case. In Greek poetry *ὠφελεῖν* is sometimes used with the dative of the person instead of the accusative, and *ἔπειθαι* with the accusative instead of the normal dative. In the Latin *adulari* 'to flatter', *aemulari* 'to emulate', *desperare* 'to despair of', *curare* 'to care about', and many others take either case without distinction. Cf. Schmalz, Lat. Gram.⁴ p. 372. In German *es kostet mich eine Mark* and *es kostet mir eine Mark* are used without the slightest difference.

All of this shows that a real consistent feeling of distinction between the two cases was not at any time attained to. While it must be admitted that the dative did in course of time generally suggest an attitude that may be called interest, yet this was always far from definite, and not by any means so strong a force as the association with other words and constructions which explains all of these inconsistencies and variations. The dative or the accusative is used as the sole object of a verb simply because it has become the habit to use it, and the whole construction is mechanically reproduced in speaking without analysis.

Just so soon, however, as the dative is the secondary object and is used with an accusative direct object, there is a situation which causes attending to the difference between the two, so that the former is felt as expressing something akin to interest. But the same implication is there when both words are uninflected, for the mere collocation of the two words with the verb necessarily means that they stand in different relations to it, i. e. usually both cannot stand in the same intimate relation, and so one is the direct object, and the other the indirect. To take an English sentence like "He sold him a hat," it is merely a result of the situation that *him* is here the indirect object. With only one object "He sold him" would mean that he sold him into slavery, or if he were a base-

¹ Cf. Delbrueck, Ai. Syntax 141.

ballplayer, that his services were sold to other employers, but it would still be a direct object. But when *hat* is there as another object, the absence of any conjunction as well as the absurdity of the supposition would prevent the coming up of the idea that both he and the hat were sold, and both would be interpreted with reference to one and the same action, so that the one not so immediately affected by the selling becomes the indirect object. Usually, of two objects occurring together in this fashion, one will be a person and one a thing. Now it lies in the nature of the case that when one and the same action affects both a person and a thing, that the thing will be usually more immediately affected, while the person displays a more independent attitude; and so it comes that the dative, originating as I believe from such a suffixless case of the indirect object, is a personal case to such a large extent.

Since English is now virtually an uninflected language, it will illustrate also in other ways what I consider to have been the relative nature of this primitive Indo-European dative. In the first place, our feeling as to whether an object is direct or indirect does not depend to the slightest degree on the historical nature of a construction. Where there is only one object we always feel it as direct, no matter whether it was dative or accusative when inflections were still alive. The object after *to help, trust, please, believe, command, obey, serve, resist, threaten, forgive* is invariably felt as direct object, though the German uses the dative for all of its corresponding words, and though for at least three of them the Old English also had the dative: *helpan* 'to help', *hýran* 'to obey', and *tréowan* 'to trust in'. Conversely, we feel as indirect object the personal object even when it was originally a second accusative instead of a dative: In *I ask him a question* and *he taught me grammar* the *him* and *me* are to us as truly indirect objects as in *he sold him a hat*.

Once more, then, the primitive I. E. dative must have been a case closely corresponding to the English case of the indirect object, one whose meaning was suggested altogether by the context and required the presence of a second direct object. The only difference is that in such a primitive period of language, when expression was not yet so accurate and the development of the more concise prepositional phrases had not

yet limited the sphere of such a case, its scope was incomparably larger than in English. Mere collocation of two nouns affected by the verb sufficed in an immense number of places where we desire greater clearness, and in this way arose the whole mass of datives which are used with accusatives, even when the relation to the verb is so loose that we call it a dative of advantage rather than indirect object. To the primitive mind there was no difference between the two, nor did it distinguish between an indirect object used with a direct object and an indirect object used with an accusative of effect (*he writes me a letter*) or a cognate accusative (*run me a race*).

In order to show how the actual historic uses of the dative are related to this primitive dative, I shall now tentatively classify its principal existing meanings according to whether they seem to me to have descended directly from this primitive case of the secondary or indirect object, from the locative dative singular, the ablative dative plural, or are subsequent analogical extensions of older uses. Extensive collections of material are not aimed at. I shall give merely enough to show the probable development of the different types.

I. THE PRIMITIVE DATIVE OF THE SECONDARY OBJECT.

I put into this category all uses of the dative when found together with an accusative object, regardless of whether its connection with the verb is comparatively close or loose; for in either case mere collocation of the primitive uninflected form with the uninflected object or cognate accusative will suggest the relation of both substantives to the verb. The distinction mentioned, however, will appear in the subdivisions.

1. *The Dative as Secondary Object in Closer Connection with the Verb.*

The following are some of the most important verbs which take an indirect object alongside of an accusative¹ object: verbs meaning *to give*: Skt. *dā-*: RV. 10. 14. 12 *tāv asmābhyaṃ . . . pūnar dātām āsum adyéhā bhadrām* 'these two shall grant us again today a happy life here'. *dhā-*: RV.

¹ The dative may be a secondary object as well with a direct genitive object as with an accusative. Not to complicate the exposition I abstain from using examples of that kind, since they are interesting rather from the point of view of the genitive than the dative.

4. 12. 3 *dádhāti rátnaṃ vidhaté* 'he gives wealth to him who sacrifices'. Av. *dā-*: Y. 41. 1 *stutō garō ahurāi mazdāi dadā-mahi* 'we give praise and honor to Ahuramazda'. Gr. *δίδωμι*: E 363 *τῇ δ' ἄρ' Ἀρης δῶκε χρυσάμπυκας ἵππους* 'to her Ares gave the horses with golden frontlet'. Lat. *do*: Plaut. Rud. 4. 3. 22 *mihi si vis dare dimidium* 'if you are willing to give me half'. *praebeo*: Verg. Georg. 3. 300 *capris . . . fluvios praebere recentis* 'to furnish fresh water to the goats'. Osc. *Anagtiāi Dīrvīai dunum deded* 'Angitiaē Diaē donum dedit'. Goth. *gīfan*: Joh. 13. 26 *þana hlaif gaf Judin Seimōnis, Skariōtau* 'he gave the bread to Judas etc.'. O. H. G. *geban*: Tat. LXXXVII *gib mir thaz wazzar* 'give me the water'. Lith. *dūti*: *kaili mào dūkit kažemėkui* 'give my skin to the tanner'. O. Blg. *dati*: *dastz jīmz silq* 'he gave them power'. *to offer* (to sacrifice, pour libations): Skt. *ā-labh-*: TS. 5. 1. 8. 2 *agnibhyaḥ paçtūn ā labhate* 'to the fires he sacrifices the animals'. Av. *bar-*: V. 12. 2 *aīwyo soaθrā baraēta* 'he shall bring libations to the waters'. Gr. *ιερεύω*: v 24 *βοῦν ἱέρειν* . . . Ζηνί 'he sacrificed a bull to Zeus'. *λείβω*: Z 266 *Διὶ λείβειν αἶθοπα οἶνον* 'to pour a libation of gleaming wine to Zeus'. Lat. *immolo*: Plaut. Poen. 2. 4 *dis . . . sex immolavi agnos* 'to the gods I have sacrificed six lambs'. *libare diis dapes* (Liv. 39. 43) 'to offer a feast to the gods'. O. Sax. *offrōn*: Ps. 65. 15 *offrān sal ik thi ohson* = Germ. *Ich werde Dir Rinder opfern*. *to consecrate*: Skt. *ā-yaj-*, cf. Delbrueck, Ai. Syntax 141. Gr. *ἀγίζω*: Soph. O. C. 1494 *θεῶ . . . βούθυντον ἐστίαν ἀγίζων* 'consecrating to the god an altar for sacrificing cattle'. Lat. *consecro*: Cic. Verr. 2. 4. 29 *candelabrum . . . consecrare Jovi*. Similarly Germ. *weihe*. *to distribute*: Skt. *vi-bhaj-*: RV. 1. 123. 3 *yād adyā bhāgāṃ vibhājāsi nṛbhyah* 'if you today distribute to men their share'. Gr. *νέμω*: ζ 188 *Ζεὺς δ' αὐτὸς νέμει ὄλβον . . . ἀνθρώποισιν* 'Zeus himself distributes wealth to men'. Lat. *distribuo*: Caes. B. G. 4. 22 *has (sc. onerarias naves) equitibus distribuit* 'he distributed them to the horsemen'. *to sell and to lend*: Gr. *πωλέω*: Her. 1. 165 *ἐπεῖτε σφι Χίοι τὰς νήσους . . . οὐκ ἐβούλοντο ὠνευμένοισι πωλέειν* 'since to them wishing to buy the Chians were not willing to sell the islands'. *δανείζω*: Dem. 27. 27 *τῷ Μοιριάδῃ πεντακοσίας δραχμὰς ἐδάνεισεν* 'he lent D. five hundred drachmas'. Lat. *vendo*: Plaut. Ps. 1. 3. 126 *juravistin te illam nulli venditurum nisi mihi* 'did

you promise to sell her to no one except me?' *faenero*: Plin. 2. 4. 6. 13 *sol suum lumen ceteris quoque sideribus faenerat* 'the sun lends its light also to the other stars'. Germ. *jemandem etwas verkaufen, jemandem etwas leihen*. to owe: Skt. *dhar-*: cf. Hopkins, TAPA. 37. 94. Gr. ὀφείλω: Δ 688 πολέσιν γὰρ Ἑπείοι χρεῖος ὀφείλον 'for the Epeans owed debts to many'. Lat. *debeo*: Cic. Fam. 13. 56 *Mylasis et Alabandis pecuniam Cluvio debent*. Germ. *jemandem etwas schulden*. to begrudge, envy, and their opposites: Av. *rā-*: Y. 28. 8 *yaēibyasčā ī rārəharəhōi* 'und wem du es sonst gönnen wirst'. Lat. *invideo*: Verg. Aen. 8. 508 *mihi . . . senectus invidet imperium* 'old age begrudges me the dominion'. Germ. *jemandem etwas gönnen oder misgönnen*. to take away, deprive:¹ Skt. *pramuṣ*: RV. 1. 24. 11 *mā na² āyuh prā moṣīh* 'do not take away for us our lives'. Gr. ἀφαιρέω: ξ 455 σῖτον μὲν σφιν ἀφείλε Μεσαύλιος 'M. took away for them the food'. Lat. *eripio*: Plaut. Mil. 3. 2. 2 *eripiam ego hodie concubinam militi* 'I will today snatch away for the soldier his concubine'. Goth. *afslagan*: Marc. 14. 47 *afslōg imma ausō* 'he struck off for him (his) ear'. O. Sax. *biniman*: Hel. 5498 *endi im is giwādi bināmun* = Germ. *Und sie nahmen ihm seine Kleidung*. to forgive, pardon: Skt. *çrath-*: RV. 1. 24. 14 *asmābhyam . . . énānsi çrathah kṛtāni* 'pardon (lit. 'loosen') us the sins committed'. *āva-sarj-*: RV. 7. 86. 5 *āva drugdhāni pītṛya sṛjā nah* 'forgive us the misdeeds of our fathers'. Gr. συγγιγνώσκω: Eur. And. 840 *συγγνώσεται σοι τήνδ' ἀμαρτίαν πόσις* 'your husband will pardon you this offence'. Lat. *ignosco*: Cic. Att. 1. 1. 4 *abs te peto ut mihi hoc ignoscas* 'I ask of you that you pardon me this'. Goth. *aflētan*: Matth. 6. 14 *jabai aflētiṣ mannam missadēdins izē* 'if you forgive men their sins'. O. H. G. *bilāzzan*: Ot. 2. 21. 35 *sculd bilāz uns allēn* 'forgive us all our debts'. Lith. *atlēisti*: Matth. 6. 11 *atlēisk mums mūsu kaltės* 'forgive us our sins'. Similarly O. Blg. *ostaviti*: Zogr. Luc. 11. 4 *ostavi namz grēchy našę*.

¹ The dative with verbs of depriving may have been influenced by the opposites meaning 'to give' and the like, as is maintained by Brugmann, Gr. . 2. 2². 483; nevertheless from our point of view the dative is here just as near to the use of the primitive dative as anywhere else.

² The position of the enclitic will prevent its being taken as a genitive with the following word rather than a dative.

To say, tell: Skt. *vac-*: RV. 5. 1. 12 *āvocāma kavāyē . . . vācaḥ* 'we said a word to the seer'. *vad-*: RV. 2. 39. 6 *ōsthāv iva mādhu āsné vādantā* 'like lips speaking honey to the mouth'. Av. *sqh-*: Y. 44. 9 *kaθā mōi paitišā sah-yāt asīšitš* 'whether the Lord will give (make known) to me promises'. Gr. *είπον*: ι 355 *καί μοι τεὸν οὖνομα εἰπέ* 'and tell me your name'. *ἐννέπω*: α I *ἄνδρα μοι ἐννεπε* 'tell me (about) the man'. Lat. *dico*: Tib. 1. 3. 32 *tibi dicere laudes* 'to tell you praises' i. e. 'to praise you'. *nuntio*: Plaut. Am. 1. 1. 43 *ut haec nuntiem uxori suae* 'that I may relate this to his wife'. Goth. *qīpan*: Marc. I 44 *saī ei mannhun ni qīpais waiht* 'see to it that you do not tell anybody anything'. O. H. G. *sagēn*: Ot. 2. 12, 15 *ih sagēn thir . . . racha seltsāna* 'I will tell you a strange thing'. Lith. *pasakýti*: Jurk.¹ 100 *jei mótyna tēsą pasāki* 'her mother told her the truth'. O. Blg. *rešti*: Zogr. Luc. 6. 39 *reče že pritrčq jimz* 'he told them a parable'. to command: Skt. *brū-* (usually 'speak'): RV. 1. 161. 2 *ékam camasām catúrah kṛnotana tād vo devā abruvan* "'make one cup into four," that the gods have commanded you'. Gr. *ἐπιτέλλω*: ψ 349 *ἀλόχῳ δ' ἐπὶ μῦθον ἔτελλεν* 'he enjoined a command upon his wife'. Lat. *impero*: Caes. B. G. 4. 22 *magnum eis numerum obsidum imperat* 'he enjoined upon them a large number of hostages'. Germ. *jemandem etwas befehlen*. to promise and to prophesy: Av. *mrav-*: Y. 32. 12 *aēibyō mazdā akā mraot* 'M. foretold them evil'. Gr. *ὑπισχνέομαι*: I 263 *ὅσσα τοι . . . ὑπέσχετο δῶρα* 'what gifts he promised you'. *μαντεύομαι*: T 420 *τί μοι θάνατον μαντεύεαι*: 'why do you foretell death to me?' Lat. *polliceor*: Cic. Imp. Pomp. 24. 69 *id omne . . . tibi et populo Romano polliceor* 'all this I promise you and the Roman people'. *praedico*: Verg. Aen. 3. 713 *hos mihi praedixit luctus* 'he prophesied me these sorrows'. Goth. *faúraqīpan*: Gal. 5. 21 *þatei faúraqīpa izwis* 'what I foretell you'. O. Sax. *gihētan*: Hel. 1388 *gihēt im heþanriki* 'he promised them the kingdom of heaven'. Lith. *pažadėti*: Jurk. 75 *pažadėje jėmdvėm giarās dēnās* 'he promised them a good time' (lit. 'good days'). to answer: Skt. *prati-pad-*: Ch. Up. 5. 11.

¹ The abbreviation Jurk. refers to Jurkschat, Litauische Märchen und Erzählungen, Heidelberg, 1898. I have retained the peculiarities of spelling there found, except that I have substituted *ē* and *ū* for *ie* and *uo*.

3 *tebhyo na sarvam iva pratipatsye* 'I shall not answer them everything'. Lat. *respondeo*: Plaut. Most. 5. 1. 76 *aliud ergo nunc tibi respondeo* 'I therefore answer you something else'. Goth. *andhafjan*: Matth. 27. 14 *ni andhōf imma wipra ni ainhun waúrdē* 'he answered him not a word'. Germ. *beantworte mir diese Frage*. to complain of: Skt. *garh-*: RV. 4. 3. 5 *kathā ha tād vārunāya . . . garhase* 'how do you complain of that to Varuna?'. Av. *garəz-*: Y. 32. 9 *tā uxδā yūš-maibyā garəzē* 'these words I complain to you'. Gr. *ἀνακλαίωμαι*: Soph. Phil. 938 *ὑμῖν τὰδ' . . . ἀνακλαίωμαι* 'to you I complain (of) this'. Germ. *jemandem sein Leid klagen*. to sing: Skt. *arc-*: RV. 5. 30. 6 *túbhyéd . . . árcanty arkám* 'to thee they sing the song'. Gr. *ἐπαιδω*: Xen. Mem. 2. 6. 11 *ἃ μὲν αἱ Σειρῆνες ἐπηδον τῷ Ὀδυσσεύϊ* 'what (incantations) the Sirens sang to Odysseus'. Lat. *cano*: Ambr. Hym. 24. 12 *tibi . . . ymnnum . . . canimus* 'we sing praise unto thee'. Verg. Aen. 2. 124 *mihi iam multi crudele canebant artificis scelus* 'many already sung (foretold) to me the cruelty of the subtle schemer'. O. H. G. *singan*: H. 24. 12 *thir . . . lob . . . singemēs* 'we sing praise unto thee'. to write:¹ Gr. *γράφω*: *γράφον μοι ἐπιστόλιον*² 'write me a little letter'. Lat. *scribo*: Cic. Att. 4. 4 *quod tibi . . . scriberem* 'what I might write to you'. Goth. *mēljan*: I. Tim. 3. 14 *þata þus mēlja* 'this I write to you'. Lith. *parašyti*: Marc. 10. 5 *jis jūms tē prisākymą parāszē* 'he wrote you this commandment'. to teach:³ Skt. *vī-brū-*: RV. 1. 145. 5 *vy ābravīd vayúnā mārtebhyo 'gnīh* 'Agni taught to mortals wonderful things'. Lat. *praecipio*: Plaut. Trin. 2. 2. 17 *moribus vivito antiquis, quae ego tibi praecipio, ea facito* 'live according to the ancient customs, what I teach you, that do'. O. Sax. *lērian*: Hel. 2171 *lērda . . . godes willeon gumun* 'taught God's will to men'. to show: Skt. *samanu-diç-*:

¹ These datives of course do not go back to I. E. times, since writing was a later accomplishment.

² From a papyrus of the second century A. D., edited by Viereck in the Berliner Griechische Urkunden 2. 84 f.

³ I consider the dative of the person as a more primitive construction than the regular second accusative. The latter evidently arose by mechanically combining the constructions *διδάσκειν τι* and *διδάσκειν τινά*, which became possible only after the difference between direct and indirect object was no longer altogether a relative matter, i. e. after the development of a formal distinction between the dative and the accusative.

AB. 2. 7. 12 *ṣamitṛbhyaṣ caivainat tan nigrabhṭṛbhyaṣ ca samanudīcati* 'he points it out to those who slay and hold down (the victim)'. Gr. δεικνυμι: N 244 δεικνὺς σῆμα βροτοῖσιν showing a sign (of the lightning) to men'. Lat. *monstro*: Enn. ap. Cic. Div. 1. 58. 132 *alteri monstrant viam* 'show the way to another'. Goth. *taiknjan*: Marc. 14. 15 *sa izwis taik-neiþ kēlikn mikilata* 'he will show you a large upper room'. O. Sax. *wisian*: Hel. 1871 *the im te heðanrikea thena weg wīsit* 'who shows them the way to the kingdom of heaven'. Lith. *parodyti*: Marc. 14. 15 *jis paródys jūm dideleṣ svetl̃yczq* as in Goth. O. Blg. *pokazati*: Zogr. Luc. 5. 14 *pokaži se ierēori* 'show yourself to the priest'.

To stretch out, raise: Skt. *tan-*: RV. 1. 115. 4 *rātrī vāstras tanute simāsmāi*¹ 'night stretches out her dress to all'. *prā-sarj-*: RV. 4. 53. 4 *prāsrāg bāhū bhūvanasya prajābhyah* 'he stretched out his arms to the generations of the world'. Gr. ἀνέχω: Γ 318 θεοῖσι δὲ χεῖρας ἀνέσχον 'they lifted up (in prayer) their hands to the gods'. Lat. *tendo*: Caes. B. G. 7. 48 *Romanis de muro manus tendebant* 'to the Romans from the wall they stretched out their hands'. to bring, carry: Skt. *bhar-*: RV. 5. 1. 10 *túbhyam bharanti kṣitāyo . . . balim* 'to you men bring tribute'. *vah-*: RV. 1. 124. 12 *amā saté vahasi bhūri vāmām* 'to him being at home you bring much wealth'. Av. *čim haxa hašē baraiti* 'what does the friend bring to the friend?'. Gr. φέρω: μ 63 ἀμβροσίην Διὶ πατρὶ φέρουσιν 'they (the doves) bring ambrosia to Zeus'. Lat. *fero*: Plaut. Am. 2. 2. 86 *osculum tetuli tibi* 'I brought you a kiss'. Goth. *atbairan*: Marc. 12. 15 *atbairiþ mis skatt* 'bring me the denarius'. O. H. G. *bringen*: Ot. 1. 5. 4 *brāht er therera werolti diuri arunti* 'he brought to this world precious tidings'. Lith. *parnėszti*: Jurk. 85 *asz tau pařneszu nōrs rastinį* 'I bring you at least a foundling'. O. Blg. *nesti*: Mar. Matth. 14. 11 *nese (glavq) materi svojeji* 'she brought (the head) to her mother'. to send: Skt. *prā-hi-*: RV. 10. 16. 1 *āthem enam prā hiṇutāt pitṛbhyah* 'then send him (the soul of the departed) forth to his fathers'. Gr. πέμπω: λ 634 μή μοι Γοργείην κεφαλὴν . . . ἐξ Αἰδος πέμψειεν 'lest she (Persephone) might send me the head of Gorgo from Hades'. *ἱημι*: λ 6 ἡμῖν δ' . . . ἱκμενον οὖρον ἱει 'sent us a favorable breeze'. προῖάπτω: A 3 ψυχὰς Αἰδι προῖ-

¹ This word is here taken as a neuter, not masculine.

αψεν 'sent the souls to Hades'. Lat. *mitto*: Caes. B. G. 1. 18 *quem . . . Caesari Haedui miserant* 'which (i. e. the cavalry) the Haedui had sent Caesar'. Goth. *insandjan*: Joh. 15. 26 *paneī ik insandja izwis* 'whom I shall send you'. O. Engl. *sendan*: Beow. 471 *sende ic Wylfingum . . . ealde mādmas* 'I send the W. old treasures'. Lith. *kàd mán ūrdelī siuntė* 'if he should send me the order'. *to throw*: Skt. *as-*: RV. 3. 30. 17 *brahmadvīṣe tāpuṣīm hetīm asya* 'hurl upon the hater of the brahma the glowing arrow'. *prá-har-*: TS. 5. 1. 6. 4 *váj-ram bhrātrvyāya prá harati* 'he hurls the bolt against the enemy'. Gr. *προβάλλω*: Ar. Plut. 798 *τρωγάλια τοῖς θεωμένοις προβαλόντ'* 'throwing fruit to the spectators'. *ἐπιπροέμμι*: Δ 94 *Μενελάω ἐπιπροέμμεν ταχὺν ἰόν* 'to shoot toward Menelaus the swift arrow'. Lat. *iaculor*: Verg. Aen. 2. 276 *iaculatus puppibus*¹ *ignis* 'hurling fire to (upon) the sterns'. Lith. *smōgti*: Jurk. 71 *į akis jam smāge tą žodį* 'he hurls into his face (lit. him into the face) the word'.

The three or four categories of which examples have been given by no means exhaust the possible combinations in which the mere collocation of a secondary or indirect object with a direct object or internal object would suggest those notions which are now attributed to the dative case. Leaving out of account the extremely numerous words which are either synonyms of the categories mentioned, or express different shades of the same ideas, there are others which do not really belong to them and yet may have been influenced by them, though even then we cannot be sure of the priority of one over the other, since both would take the indirect object with equal right. Thus Skt. *su-* 'to press' takes the dative e. g. RV. 1. 99 *Jātavedase sunavāma sómam* 'let us press soma to J.'; and this possibly is due to association with expressions like *indrāya sómam . . . juhota* 'pour out (a libation) of soma to Indra', an example of the common dative after verbs meaning 'to offer'. In the same way the dative after 'to cause, create', unless it be considered a dative of interest, can be taken as due to the analogy of 'to give'. Cf. RV. 1. 92. 17 *jyótir jánāya cakráthuh* 'caused man (i. e. created for man) light'. More remote would be the possibility of Engl. *do me*

¹ The fact that the dative is here a thing makes it appear to approach the directive sense. Cf. p. 23.

a favor Germ. *tue mir den Gefallen* having been felt as similar to sentences with verbs of giving. On the other hand, verbs meaning 'to pray' may be considered as verbs of saying, whence the dative, e. g. in Gr. *πολλὰ δ' . . . ἡρᾶθ' ὁ γεραίος Ἀπόλλωνι* (A 36) 'much the old man prayed to Apollo'. Similarly those meaning 'to swear', which have the dative as secondary object, e. g. in Gr. *νῦν μοι ὁμοσσον . . . καρτερὸν ὄρκον* (T 108) 'now swear me a mighty oath', Lat. *iurare alicui aliquid* (as Stat. Th. 4. 396) 'to vow something to somebody', or Germ. *jemandem einen Eid schwören*. Words meaning 'to prohibit' may take a dative either because associated with verbs of speaking in general, as Gr. *ἀπειπεῖν τινί τι* (Ar. Pol. 2. 5. 19): *εἶπον* 'I said', and Lat. *interdicere alicui aliquid* (e. g. Liv. 34. 7): *dico*, or else through the influence of the opposite, 'to command', as in Germ. *jemandem etwas verbieten*, just like *gebieten*. Since, however, such similarities, as was remarked above, do not necessarily show us the real historic connection, inasmuch as any one of such combinations is derived equally well from the primitive case of the secondary object, I will simply mention others without attempting to trace such connections.

Common to several languages is the dative with 'to believe': Gr. *πίθουμαι*: Plat. Apol. 25 E *ταῦτα ἐγὼ σοι οὐ πίθουμαι* 'that I do not believe you'. Lat. *credo*: Ter. Heaut. 4. 1. 11 *vin me istuc tibi . . . credere?* 'do you wish me to believe you that?' Germ. *das glaube mir*. Of other examples, aside from the Lat. *fidem habere alicui* (e. g. Ter. Eun. 1. 2. 117) 'to put trust in some one (lit. have trust to)', which is probably due to the analogy of verbs meaning 'to trust', I may mention the following: Skt. *yā-* 'to go': RV. 8. 26. 15 *asmābhyaṃ . . . yātām vartih* 'come the way to us'; Gr. *πελάζω* 'cause to approach': ι 39 *Ἰλιόθεν με . . . ἄνεμος Κικόνεσσι πέλασσευ*, 'Ismárho' 'from Ilium a wind drove me to the Ciconians, to Ismarus'; Lat. *flecto*, O. H. G. *biugan* 'to bend': Ambr. Hym. 2. 6 Lat. *tibique genu flectimus* O. H. G. *dir joh chniu piugamēs* 'and to thee we bend our knee'.

In practically all of the examples so far mentioned the word found in the case of the indirect object designated a person, which is explained above by the normally more independent position a person occupies toward an action as compared with

a thing. In exceptional cases, however, the situation may make it perfectly clear that the person is the more directly affected, and then the primitive case of the indirect object might designate a thing as opposed to the direct personal object. A sentence like the just mentioned Ἰλιόθεν με ἄνεμος πέλασσεν Ἰσμάρῳ would allow the place name Ismarus to be interpreted as the indirect object even if it were not characterized formally as a dative, since the whole context makes it clear that the place is not to be moved to the person, but the reverse, so that here exceptionally the personal object is the more intimately affected and is therefore felt as direct. In expressions like the Latin *demittere aliquem Orco* 'to send some one to the world below' the force of the preposition would be a second hindrance to reversing direct and indirect object; for the lower world could not possibly be sent down to a human being. On the other hand, an uninflected case of the indirect object clearly could not be used in expressions like Skt. *agne náya . . . rāyé asmān*¹ 'Agni, lead us to wealth' (RV. 1. 189. 1), *yám . . . praṇināya mahatē saúbhagāya* 'whom it has led forth to great bliss' (ib. 3. 8. 11), Lat. *me . . . morti dabo* 'I shall give myself to death' (Plaut. Merc. 2. 4. 4). Since the ordinary conception would be rather that of bringing wealth, good fortune, and death to man rather than man to wealth, etc., the reverse could occur only when there was a formal characterization of the case of the indirect object. Such examples are therefore not to be classed as belonging to the uses of the dative inherited from the primitive case of the secondary object.

Where, however, two objects depending on one word are both non-personal, one normally will occupy a position of greater independence to the action of the verb than the other, and will therefore be felt as indirect object even when there is no difference as to inflectional ending. In Lat. *caelo palmas . . . tetendit* 'stretched out his hands to the sky' (Verg. Aen. 2. 688) the relative independence of the sky toward the action

¹ It might be supposed that the primitive dative could have been characterized by its position before it had received a suffix (cf. Wundt, loc. cit.), and would therefore be capable of expressing such unusual relations after all. I do not believe, however, that there is sufficient evidence to make us suppose that the position of the dative had been fixed so early.

is as great in comparison with the hands as usually of the person as opposed to the thing. Similar are *pelago Danaum* ... *dona praecipitare* 'to throw to the sea the gift of the Greeks' (ib. 2. 36), *profundo vela dabit* 'will give sail to the deep', i. e. 'will set sail' (ib. 12. 263), and Gr. *νηοὶ δ' ἐπ' αὖρος* *ἀνεμῶν* ... *Ζεὺς* 'Zeus aroused (i. e. sent) a wind to the ships' (1. 67). It is not at all necessary to assume that there was any personification¹ in most of these locutions, while at the same time admitting the possibility of it here and there. On the whole they are simply and naturally derived from the case of the indirect object in its most vague and primitive form. We cannot, however, close our eyes to the fact that the extent to which these constructions were employed by Vergil and later Roman poets² must have been something purely artificial, and corresponds to nothing either in popular Latin or other languages.

The derivation of the dative from an undifferentiated primitive case of the indirect object will thus be seen to explain both the dominance of personal datives in these constructions as well as the fact that a few non-personal indirect objects do occur: it simply followed from the conditions under which one of two objects will be felt as relatively more independent of the action of the verb than the other. At the same time it explains how this same case could be used in many locutions where a place notion might either have actually crept in or have been read into them. Nearly all datives used with verbs of stretching out, bringing, sending, hurling, and many with verbs of giving and the like can be conceived in this way, and this was, as I believe, the starting-point which led the dative to adopt the ending of another primarily local case, which will be discussed below.

2. *The Dative of the Secondary Object in Looser Connection with the Verb.*

Between datives which are very closely and very loosely connected with the verb, between 'datives of the indirect

¹ Gaedicke, *Der Accusativ im Veda* 139, the author of the 'grammatical' theory, would apply the principle of personification even to the incontestably local *samudrāya* 'to the sea' of p. 3.

² Cf. Landgraf, *ALL.* 8. 70.

object' and 'datives of interest', there is no difference as to essential nature, nor is there any sharp dividing line. Some of the examples already mentioned as being in closer connection may very well be taken as datives of advantage or disadvantage. Verbs meaning 'to consecrate' take a dative which may be translated by 'for' as well as 'to', e. g. Lat. *consecrare Iovi* 'to consecrate to' or 'for Jove'. So the dative after verbs of depriving may equally well be considered a dative of disadvantage, e. g. Plaut. Rud. 3. 4. 54 *oculos eripiam tibi* may be 'I shall snatch you your eyes' or 'I shall snatch away your eyes for you'. We may say 'pardon us our sins' or 'pardon our sins for us'. The difference between the 'to' and 'for' datives in fact looms large to us principally because we have come to use different prepositions in most instances, but where we still use the case of the secondary object, the distinction is by no means sharp. We feel no essential difference between the use of the indirect object in 'tell us a story', the border-line case 'strike him a blow', and the datives of advantage in 'sing us a song', 'build yourselves a house', and 'buy her a present'. At the same time these English remnants show how these freer datives are just as independent of grammatical form as those in closer connection with the verb; for here also the English, which does not differ in form between direct and indirect object, is just as clear as the languages with these case distinctions. We may conclude, then, as far as the primitive uninflected I. E. dative is concerned, that it also was used whenever the presence of a direct object or internal object would make it clear that the secondary object had not only a looser connection with the verb than the primary object, but also one that was much more loose than in cases where we ordinarily speak of the 'indirect object'. And this means that of the historic 'datives of interest' those which are used with an object accusative go back as a type to the primitive uninflected dative.

The field of such a 'dative of interest' is very large indeed. It is not limited to a certain number of verbs which are habitually associated with certain double objects, but can be used in almost any connection. It will therefore not be feasible to subdivide the examples according to the verbs used with

them, which is not essential anyway, but rather according to whether the dative is a dative of advantage (or disadvantage) or an ethical dative or dative of the person judging, and secondarily, as far as feasible, according to whether the primary object is a direct object or accusative of effect or cognate accusative.

I. *The Dative of Advantage or Disadvantage with a Direct Object.* Skt. RV. I. 113. 4 *citrā vi dúro na āvaḥ* 'the brightly colored (Dawn) opened for us the gates'. RV. I. 15. 12 *devān devayatē yaja* 'honor the gods for (the sake of) the pious'. AB. 7. 16. 1 *tasmā upākṛtāya niyoktāraṃ na vividuh* 'for him, when he had been brought up, they found no fetterer (one who would put him in chains)'. Av. Yt. 13. 99 *yō ašāi ravō yažša* 'who for Aša sought space'. Gr. H 314 *τοῖσι δὲ βοῦν ἱέρευσεν* 'for them he sacrificed a bull (to Zeus)'. P 547 *ἦντε πορφυρέην ἱρὴν θνητοῖσι πανύσση Ζεύς* 'as when Zeus stretches out for mortals the purple rainbow'. Xen. An. I. 3. 16 *τὰ ἄκρα ἡμῖν . . . προκαταλαβεῖν* 'to seize the heights beforehand for us'. Lat Plaut. Most. I. I. 44 *tu tibi istos habeas turtures, piscis, avis* 'may you have (keep) for yourself those turtle-doves, fishes, birds'. ib. 3. I. 115 *continuo est alias aedis mercatus sibi* 'at once he bought another dwelling for himself'. Hor. Carm. I. 17. 3 *defendit aestatem capellis* 'wards off the heat for my goats'. Osc. T. B. 13. 14 *suaepis . . . altrei . . . zicolom dicust* 'siquis alteri . . . diem dixerit'. Umbr. VI a 5 *aserio . . . anglaf esona mehe, tote Iioueine* 'observa . . . oscines divinas mihi, civitati Iguvinae'. Goth. Marc. 8. 19 *þans fimf hlaibans gabrak fimf þūsundjōm* 'he broke the five loaves for five thousand'. O. H. G. Ot. I. 3. 11 *thia arca sinēn kindon rihta in den undōn* 'directed the ark upon the waves for his children'. ib. 4. 29 *alt quena thīnu ist thir kind berantu* 'your old wife shall bear you a son'. Lith. Jurk. 18 *kūta pāczę sau pasijęszkōje* 'sought for himself another wife'. ib. 20 *asz jį tātu sužvejosiū* 'I will fish it (the ax) out for you'. O. Blg. *priobrešti. žiznė sebė* 'quaere tibi victum'.

II. *The Dative of Advantage or Disadvantage with an Accusative of Effect.* Skt. RV. I. 32. 2 *tvāṣtāsmāi vājraṃ svaryāṃ tatakṣa* 'Tvashtar made him his whizzing thunderbolt'. ib. 7. 87. 1 *rādat pathó várūṇaḥ sūryāya* 'may Varuna open up paths for the sun'. Av. Y. 62. 7 *yaēibyō aēm hąmpačaiti*

xšāfnīmča sūirīmča 'for whom he cooks the night and early meal'. Gr. A 607 ἐκάστῳ δῶμα . . . Ἡφαίστος ποίησεν 'for each one Hephaestus had built a house'. Pind. I. 8. 147 τῷ τις . . . Κλεάνδρῳ πλεκέτω μυρσίνας στέφανον 'therefore let some one twist a wreath of myrtle for C.' Lat. Plaut. Most. I. I. 75 *mihi non facies moram* 'you will not cause (make) delay for me'. id. Curc. I. I. 25 *num tu pudicae quoipiam insidias locas?* 'are you laying an ambush for any modest (maiden)?' Goth. Luc. 9. 33 *gawaúrkejaima hleiþrōs þrins, aina þus jah aina Mōsē jah aina Hēlijin* 'let us make three tabernacles, one for thee, one for Moses, and one for Elijah'. O. H. G. Wess. Pr. *dō gareti sanctus Johannes baptista den wech demo gotis sune* 'thereupon St. John the Baptist prepared the way for the son of God'. Lith. Jurk. 80 *sāwa waikāms wēk swōdbq taīsi* 'soon prepared a wedding for his children'. O. Blg. Zogr. Luc. 9. 33 *sātivorimz skiniję tri, tebē jediną i jediną Mōsēovi i jediną Iliji* as in Goth.

III. *The Dative of Advantage or Disadvantage with an Internal Object* (Cognate Accusative). Whether the accusative is one of kindred formation with the verb or only of kindred meaning does not of course affect the nature of the dative. Skt. CB. II. 3. 3. 6 *ācāryāya kārma karoti* 'for the teacher he performs a service'. Gr. Eur. Med. 1292 *ὅσα βροτοῖς ἔρεξας ἤδη κακά* 'what evils you have already brought about for mortals'. Lat. Hor. C. 3. I. 4 *carmina non prius . . . virginibus puerisque canto* 'before shall I not sing the songs for the maidens and boys'. M. H. G. *einen stoz stiez er im* = Eng. *he struck him a blow*.

WALTER PETERSEN.

BETHANY COLLEGE, LINDSBURG, KANSAS.

(To be continued)

II.—AN EPIGRAM OF PHILODEMUS AND TWO LATIN CONGENERS.

I.—ANTH. PAL. XI 34 AND ANTH. LAT. 458.

Some years ago Professor K. F. Smith discussed very entertainingly in this journal ¹ the history of the Latin epigram which is named as the source of Ben Jonson's familiar lyric,

Still to be neat, still to be dressed
As you were going to a feast;
Still to be powdered, still perfumed, etc.

The Latin verses, of unknown authorship and of uncertain time, but certainly antique, have come down in one of the several ancient collections of fugitive verse which modern scholars have combined into the so-called *Anthologia Latina*, and are printed as number 458 in the edition of Riese.² His text is as follows:

Semper munditias, semper Basilissa decores,
semper dispositas arte decente comas,
et comptos semper cultus unguentaque semper,
omnia sollicita compta videre manu,
non amo. neglectam, mihi se quae comit amica,
se det: inornata simplicitate valet.
vincula nec curet capitis discussa soluti,
nec decoret faciem: mel habet illa suum.
fingere se semper non est confidere amori.
quid quod saepe decor, cum prohibetur, adest?

Jonson's song is a very free rendering, it will be seen, of the general antithesis between the "adulteries of art" and native simplicity, which is the theme of the Latin verses. In actual words little has been borrowed, and in the latter part of the first stanza—

Lady it is to be presumed,
Though art's hid causes are not found,
All is not sweet, all is not sound—

¹ Vol. 29 (1908), pp. 133-155.

² Bachrens PLM IV, p. 83.

a thought is introduced which is scarcely hinted at in the Latin lines. However, the English scholars who made this identification were probably right, and had correct feeling in putting together the two poems. For, apart from the similarity of theme and the initial *munditias*, the essential point of resemblance, which deserves to be called imitation, is the anaphora of "still," very gracefully and musically introduced, corresponding to the repetition (which is not exactly anaphora) of *semper* in the Latin lines. It is in fact this repetition which is the most essential characteristic of the style of both poems, and constitutes no small part of such effectiveness as they possess. Toward the end of his paper (p. 154) Professor Smith inquires into the origin and time of the Latin poem, pointing out how difficult it is in compositions of this sort, the style of which had been fixed as early as Martial, to determine a date at any point between the second and the fifth centuries. He concludes with the suggestion that it may have been derived from a Greek epigram of the erotic type such as is represented so abundantly in the fifth book of the Palatine Anthology.

It is not quite with confidence that we can lay hand upon the exact and ultimate original which is thus surmised, but with confidence at least that a similar *motif*, with similar stylistic traits, can be cited from a known author and a known period of antiquity, that the attention is invited of those who may have been interested in Professor Smith's study. I refer to an epigram of Philodemus of Gadara, the Epicurean philosopher, client of L. Calpurnius Piso, whom Cicero characterizes without mention of his name, in the invective against his patron of the year 55 B. C. (in *Pison.* 68 ff.). In these days when the Palatine Anthology is little read, he is doubtless best known to classical students for the philosophical and rhetorical writings which have been recovered from the charred rolls of an Epicurean library at Herculaneum. Of his poems, all of which are short and fall under the comprehensive rubric of epigram, twenty-four, out of a somewhat larger number attributed to him, are recognized by Kaibel¹ as genuine. They are preserved in the Palatine and the Planudean Anthologies, and the

¹ Philodemi Gadarensis Epigrammata, ed. G. Kaibel, Ind. lect. Greifswald 1885.

one which I would here compare with our Latin epigram is A. P. XI 34:

Λευκοῖνους πάλι δὴ καὶ ψάλματα καὶ πάλι Χίους
οἶνους, καὶ πάλι δὴ σμύρναν ἔχειν Συρίην,
καὶ πάλι κωμάζειν, καὶ ἔχειν πάλι διψάδα πόρνην
οὐκ ἐθέλω· μισῶ ταῦτα τὰ πρὸς μανίην.
Ἄλλα με ναρκίσσοις ἀναδήσατε, καὶ πλαγιαύλων
γεύσατε, καὶ κροκίνοις χρίσατε γυνὴ μύροις,
καὶ Μυτιληναίῳ τὸν πνεύμονα τέγξατε Βάκχῳ,
καὶ συζεύξατέ μοι φωλάδα παρθενικήν.¹

That these two poems have not been compared before, which seems to be the case, may be attributed to the relative neglect which has been the fate of all but the most famous writers embraced in the Greek Anthology, and to the almost total neglect of the whole of the Anthologia Latina. Still, while the resemblances of the Greek verses to our Latin poem are I think unmistakable, yet the differences are very considerable, and a relationship would not perhaps be assumed without a closer study of the two compositions. In the first place, while there is a

¹ The editions of Jacobs and of Dübner are of course accessible in any library. Kaibel's more recent publication is indispensable for the study of Philodemus, but as a university "program" of a distinguished scholar it has become very difficult to procure. For those who may not have any of these books at hand a few notes may be added: λευκοῖνους (sc. στεφάνους) i. e. wreaths woven of the λευκῶιον (white violet), and apparently expensive or difficult to obtain. Cf. Theophr. ap. Athen. 15, p. 680 ε (στεφανωματικὰ ἄνθη) πρῶτόν τε τῶν ἀνθῶν ἐκφαίνεσθαι φησιν τὸ λευκῶιον . . . ἔπειτα νάρκισσον. For the comparison which I shall presently make with Horace the following is of interest (ibid. f): τὸ δὲ ῥόδον ὑστερεῖ τούτων καὶ τελευταῖον μὲν φαίνεται, πρῶτον δὲ παύεται (rosa quo locorum sera moretur). Πλαγιαύλων γεύσατε (a bold expression if the text is sound) "tibiarum mihi cantum percipiendum date" (Jacobs), in contrast with the more difficult and elaborate music of stringed instruments (ψάλματα). A difference of opinion about the interpretation of the whole poem hinges upon the meaning of φωλάδα παρθενικήν. Jacobs and the older interpreters explain as, "meretricem e lupanari", i. e. ex lustro, e fornice (φωλεός = hole, cave, lurking-place). But Kaibel rejects this and holds that the poet is tired of revelry with harlots and longs for honorable wedlock. To this he says συζεύξαι points as well as παρθενική. "φωλάς ea est quae in cubili iacet". He paraphrases: "facite ut virgo mecum cubile sive thalamum ingrediat." But I doubt if he is right. The scene portrayed is merely a convivium and not a wedding-feast. Παρθενική is of course contrasted with πόρνη, but probably not without a certain euphemism. φωλάδα I should explain, as against both Jacobs and Kaibel, to mean "obscure" or "humble", in contrast with the publicity of the fashionable courtesan's life.

common underlying contrast of elaboration and simplicity, yet the application is different in each poem accommodated to the situation which is created in each. In the Greek it is a *convivium*, and the antithesis is between elaborate and costly indulgence which leads to excess (ταῦτα τὰ πρὸς μανίην), and festivity of a simpler and saner sort. In the Latin epigram the same antithesis is employed in quite a different setting, as admonition to the self-embellishing Basilissa. It is obvious that there can be no close parallelism of words, or that such as there is appears in a different context. Both poems are expressions of the taste of their respective authors; but the Greek is abstract and without reference to a person or an occasion: the Latin by reason of the personal address receives a special application and motive, and in consequence yields a somewhat different tone. But in spite of these differences there are very significant resemblances, and most of all the very characteristic iteration of *πάλι*, corresponding to the equally characteristic use of *semper*, and producing the effect of a crowded and unlimited list of items suggestive of excess or satiety. As with *semper* in the Latin poem, so this use of *πάλι* is carried through the first three lines, and the whole enumeration is concluded with οὐκ ἐθέλω, corresponding to *non amo*. As is so often the case with poetical reminiscences, they appear here especially at the beginning, and as the adaptation proceeds and is fitted to the special argument or occasion the resemblance to the source of the *motif* grows less. Thus one may believe that the author of the Latin epigram, carrying in mind the insistent rhythm and passionate rejection of the first part of this poem of Philodemus, has used its theme and copied its technique, but has adapted its thought to the desired purpose of an admonition or plea to his mistress.

For that it is a plea to the courtesan to be complaisant to her lover without the delays and postponements involved in elaborate toilet and coiffure may be guessed from the two epigrams which follow it in the codex Vossianus, the first of which is likewise addressed to Basilissa:

ante dies multos nisi te, Basilissa, rogavi
et nisi praemonui, te dare posse negas;

and,

cur differs, mea lux, rogata semper?

It would seem in fact that we have here a group of poems, possibly drawn from a larger cycle, all of which show a certain kinship with epigrams of Philodemus, whether or not we are justified in saying that they were composed under his immediate influence. One poem of the Epicurean philosopher we have already examined. It is creed of revelry, but free from gross eroticism, which mars some of his other verses, nor has the author forgotten his philosophy—*μισῶ ταῦτα τὰ πρὸς μανίην*.¹ With coarser and more drastic phrase a contrast, analogous to that which is drawn between the *δυψάδα πόρνην* and the *φωλάδα παρθενικήν*, was the theme of another composition by this same Philodemus, which is not preserved,² but is referred to and briefly summarized by Horace for the purposes of his scabrous argument in Serm. I 2, 120:

parabilem amo venerem facilemque.
illam 'post paulo' 'sed pluris', 'si exierit vir',
Gallis, hanc Philodemus ait sibi, quae neque magno
stet pretio neque cunctetur cum est iussa venire.

¹ An interesting comparison may be made with Lucretius, speaking from the same point of view of Epicurean praise of nature in contrast with the costly embellishments of art, II 24:

neque natura ipsa requirit,
si non aurea sunt iuvenum simulacra per aedes, etc.

² A modern composition, apparently based upon Horace's lines, whether as a deliberate forgery or merely as the *jeu d'esprit* of some Dutch scholar, found its way into the excerpts from the Palatine MS. from which Reiske edited portions of the Anthology in 1754. It was reproduced by Brunck in the *Analecta* and even by Jacobs in his first edition, although he knew that it was not contained in the Palatine MS. Toup is said to have been the first one to cite the epigram in illustration of Horace. The whole history of this rather interesting literary curiosity is set forth by Jacobs in Wolf's *Literarische Analekten*, Vol. I (1817), p. 357 ff. The author evidently shrank from the coarseness of Horace's portrayal and sets on one side a figure of matronly severity, on the other a compliant courtesan (*Ἐφύρη*, the girl from Corinth). The concluding couplet is as follows:

*εἰ δὲ μίαν ταῦταιν, Πείσον, μ' αἰρεῖν ἐπιτέλλεις,
εἰν Ἐφύρῃ μίμνω, τὴν δ' ἄρα Γάλλος ἔχοι.*

Much more in the spirit of Horace's lines, and doubtless imitated either from him or from the lost epigram of Philodemus, is Martial IX 32 (*hanc volo, quae facilis, etc.*).

To the humorously characterizing names of the courtesan *post paulo*, *sed pluris*, or of the adulteress *si exierit vir*, in the one class of undesirable amours, correspond the descriptive designations *quae neque cunctetur* and *neque magno stet pretio* in the other. It is to the former class that Basilissa belongs, elaborate, expensive, deferring. The *motif* of delay or postponement of the lover is not touched upon (except by implication) in the first of the Latin poems from which we started (*semper munditias*), nor does it appear in the extant epigram of Philodemus cited above. Their point of community is elaboration versus simplicity. But in the two succeeding epigrams of the Basilissa cycle, delay or postponement is the main theme, as it was in the composition which Horace reports (*quae cunctetur*). The conceit was apparently a favorite one with Philodemus and appears again in a clever piece of realistic dialogue which makes up another of his compositions—a mime of Herondas compressed into the brevity of an epigram, A. P. V 46.¹

Putting together therefore the fact that the first of the Latin epigrams (*semper munditias*) corresponds in theme and in stylistic treatment (*πάλι—semper*) and even in some verbal echoes (*οὐκ ἐθέλω—non amo*) to the extant epigram of Philodemus—putting this with the circumstance that the second and third of the skits addressed to Basilissa play upon the same *motif* of delay and postponement which was contained in the epigram alluded to by Horace, it will seem most plausible I think to believe that the author of the Latin epigram wrote with conscious adaptation of poems of Philodemus, one of which we still possess.

II.—ANTH. PAL. XI 34 AND HORACE OD. I 38.

We have not been in the habit of associating Horace's lyric poetry with contemporary influences,² and it will doubtless seem

¹ α. Πηνίκα δ' ἤξεις;

β. *Ὡν σὺ θέλεις ὦρην. α. Εὐθὺ θέλω. β. Πρόαγε.

² Apropos of this remark, my friend Professor Gordon Laing, who very kindly read these notes in manuscript, called my attention to Reitzenstein's valuable address (in N. Jhbb. Vol. 21 (1908), p. 81 ff.) entitled "Horaz und die hellenistische Lyrik". As the title indicates it is the author's purpose to point out how much of Hellenistic (in contrast with Aeolic or Pindaric) motive and technique is present in the Odes.

a far cry from this epigram to *Persicos odi*; and yet I venture to believe that Horace drew the suggestion of his ode from just this source, viz., the lines of Philodemus quoted above—*λευκοίνους πάλι δῆ, κτλ.* Like the Greek the scene is the *convivium*, or its preparations, and the contrast of elaboration and simplicity is the same. The enumerated items of the Greek Horace has compacted into a single generalization,

Persicos odi puer apparatus,

odi corresponding to the concluding *οὐκ ἐθέλω* of Philodemus, although the word itself was probably suggested by the following *μισῶ ταῦτα*. In the subsequent development of Horace's poem he has selected from the varied items of elaborated revelry just one, the floral ornaments,

displicent nexae philyra coronae,

corresponding to the *λευκοίνους (στεφάνους)* with which Philodemus begins. This thought is then expanded with a further detail,

mitte sectari rosa quo locorum, etc.

The transition from the negative to the positive is made by Philodemus with *ἀλλά με ναρκίσσοις*, corresponding to

simplici myrto nihil adlabores,

and as the first part confines itself to only one of the elements enumerated by Philodemus, so the remainder of Horace's lines are taken up with the praise of the myrtle,

neque te ministrum

dedecet myrtus, etc.

The evidence of relationship rests upon identity of general theme and situation, with identical antithesis, upon the resemblance of *λευκοίνους* with *nexae philyra coronae*, and of *odi—nihil curo* with *μισῶ—οὐκ ἐθέλω*. The differences are of course

More especially, as bearing on the present argument, I would note that he there (p. 95) has put side by side our epigram of Philodemus with *Persicos odi*. More cautiously and perhaps more truly than I have done, he designates the relationship, not as one of dependence or immediate suggestion, but as displaying the same feeling (*dasselbe Empfinden*). He adds also some interesting illustrations of the conceit of the master giving instructions to his slave. Noteworthy throughout his treatment is the extent to which he uses Philodemus in illustration of Horace.

more remarkable.¹ The art of the one depends upon crowded enumeration (which the repeated *πάλι* reinforces), of the other upon almost parsimonious selection. The simplicity of Horace is seen in stronger light by this comparison, and may seem almost ostentatious. But as for the artistic result there can be no two opinions. So far from detracting from the reputation and merit of Horace, the disclosure of a source of suggestion serves only to heighten our appreciation of his taste and delicate workmanship. If we had no knowledge of Horace's acquaintance with Philodemus, it would doubtless be most natural to speak of both poets as handling independently a *motif* common to the poetical *nugae*² of the time; but in view of the fact that Horace in the second satire expressly alludes to Philodemus and summarizes a related epigram, it seems to me most probable to conclude that he derived the suggestion of his ode from the still extant epigram of Philodemus.

But it is one thing for Horace, in an early satire of cynical morality and dubious taste, to have cited an apposite epigram of Philodemus: quite another thing to assume an influence of the Greek versifier upon the mature lyric poet of a dozen or more years later. It may not therefore be amiss to review briefly some of the evidence concerning the position and influence of Philodemus in the Roman society of his day. He is first introduced to us by Cicero in the anonymous characterization referred to above (in *Pison.* 68). It is obvious that in this passage Philodemus suffers some contamination from the virulence of Cicero's invective against his patron, and yet while the character of the man suffers at Cicero's hands, the description of his poetry is generous, and earns the kind of praise which must have

¹ Although the situation in the two poems is similar, in that both deal with the appointments for the *convivium*, yet there is one difference of technique which might escape observation. Philodemus speaks without personal reference or allusion to any occasion. He creates no scene or situation. Horace, not only here, but elsewhere, with strikingly few exceptions (not more than two or three) does not speak directly from the page of his book to the reader, in the manner of Philodemus and of much modern lyric poetry. He always gives a motivation to his utterance either by addressing a person (as here *puer*, or a friend who is named), a muse or a god, or by personifying an object of address (*o navis, te triste lignum, pia testa*, etc.).

² Vid. A. P. X 104 *χαῖρε θεὰ δέσποινα . . εὐτέλη.*

been sought for in this style of elegant lubricity; poema porro facit ita festivum, ita concinnum, ita elegans, nihil ut fieri possit argutius; in quo reprehendat eum licet, si qui volet, modo leviter, non ut impurum, non ut improbum, non ut audacem, sed ut Graeculum, ut adsentatorem, ut poetam . . . De ipso (Pisone) quoque scripsit, ut omnis hominis libidines, omnia stupra, *omnia cenarum conviviorumque genera*, adulteria denique eius delicatissimis versibus expresserit. There is enough of this sort of thing in the extant epigrams (though not specifically with reference to Piso) to make the characterization wholly credible, but there are on the other hand some very charming pieces which have quite the flavor of Horatian urbanity and philosophy.¹ Indeed it would seem certain that Cicero himself thought better of Philodemus than would appear from his utterances in the invective against Piso, or at any rate formed a more favorable opinion at a later time. For in the de Fin. (II 119), of the year 45, he is named along with Siro, the teacher of Virgil, as *familiares nostros, cum optimos viros, tum homines doctissimos*. His association with Siro in this passage is significant, and it is valuable to learn that he was one of those Epicurean teachers who influenced so strongly that group of younger men who appear in the next generation as the leaders in poetry and letters. That Virgil was the devoted pupil of Siro we know from his own Catalepta (7 and 10) as well as from the ancient lives and the Servian Scholia; that Quintilius Varus was also a fellow pupil is the interpretation which must be given to the name Varus associated with Virgil's in the same passages;² that L. Varius, the epic and tragic poet, was an Epicurean is attested by Quintilian (6, 3, 78),³ although we have no record that would associate him with the instruction of Siro. It is clear therefore that the group of Horace's most intimate friends were Epicureans, and two of them at least disciples of Siro. It is, of course, superfluous to remind the reader that Horace himself in his earliest work does not yet profess that eclecticism (*nullius*

¹ See especially the invitation to Piso to join in the Epicurean festival of the "twentieth", A. P. XI 44.

² Donatus, vit. Verg. (Reiff. Sueton. p. 68) and Servius ad Ecl. 6, 13.

³ The editors read *Varo*, the MSS. *Vareo*, which, as Körte says, points to *Vario*. Cf. Körte in the article cited below.

addictus iurare in verba magistri) which was his maturer philosophical position. In the satires he is frankly Epicurean (*namque deos didici securum agere aevum*, in the playful confession of faith at the end of the journey to Brundisium).

It has been one of the disappointments of the Herculean rolls of Philodemus, so strangely preserved and so ingeniously though imperfectly deciphered—treatises which, even in their fragile and broken characters traced upon charred papyrus, have contributed not a little to the later history of philosophical and rhetorical controversy—that they yield a literature so slight and unimportant, and so barren of significance for the time and environment in which they were produced. But here and there are names and personal allusions to comrades or pupils, especially at the beginning and end of treatises. Two such fragments are discussed by A. Körte in *Rh. Mus.* 45 (1890), p. 172 ff. under the title “Augusteer bei Philodem”. The discussion is too technical to be reported in detail, and is easily accessible for those who would follow the matter further. In the first fragment a group of his pupils or listeners are addressed, who having already heard fragmentary parts of the oral discussion of the theme in question (apparently *περὶ κολακείας*) are now asked to give a cordial reception to the completed work. The certain names which appear (in the vocative) are those of Varius and Quintilius, a grouping which can of course mean no other than the comrades of Virgil and Horace; one other name is wholly lost, while the initial V (*i. e.* *Ov-*) of a fourth is still legible. Who would not leap at once to the conjecture of Virgil’s name? But this is not all. Still another fragment, at first sight a mere printer’s pie of letters, reveals in the first line enough to reconstruct *φιλαργυρία* (apparently the theme), and in the fourth and fifth lines a group of names (in the vocative) of which the following letters survive

... *τιεκαιοναρι*
 *καικοιντιλι*

Here at all events are Varius and Quintilius again, and Varius may well, as before, have been followed by the mysterious *Ov-* of the former fragment. But whether Virgil was named in the lacuna or not, it is of more interest to speculate upon the trace that is left of the preceding name, *-τιε*. And again, since specu-

lation is free, who could refrain from filling out the lacuna with *Opa]τιε*? Körte is sober and checks the ardor of his readers with the warning that nothing certain can be gathered from traces so slight (p. 177). And of course he is quite right. However, if any one will take the trouble to put together the Roman gentile names ending in *-tius*—*Trebatius*, *Numatius*, etc., he will soon discover that the field of possible conjecture is greatly narrowed, and that it will not be easy (if indeed possible) to fix upon any name equally probable with that of *Horatius*. But the identification need not be pressed, and we can satisfy ourselves with the certain names, which reveal that the friends of Horace were also the friends and listeners of Philodemus. From the mention of Philodemus in Serm. I 2, 121 it appears that he was a contemporary, and still living, as indeed for other reasons we should have reason to believe. To quote the witticism of a contemporary with approval of its point and acceptance of its doctrine is of course a compliment (however dubious in the present context), and from this perhaps we are justified in concluding that a personal relationship of friendship existed between the two men. It may be noted in contrast that the epigram of Calimachus used just before (v. 109 *hiscine versiculis*) is introduced without name. At all events not only from the epigram quoted does it appear that Horace was well acquainted with the poems of Philodemus, but also from other parts of this same satire it is apparent that he had in mind words and ideas of the same author drawn from other epigrams still extant. That Horace's *o crus, o braccia*, (v. 92) is an echo of ὦ ποδός, ὦ κνήμης (A. P. V 132), is observed by Jacobs, who also calls attention to the general resemblance of the argument of Horace's second satire with V 126. Details of comparison could be made, but they would not ornament the page nor edify the reader.¹ More wholesome are comparisons of some other epigrams with other parts of Horace, (such as V 112 καὶ παίζειν ὅτε καιρός, with *nec luisse pudet*, etc.), which I shall not now undertake to collect. Many isolated parallels to Horace will be found in Jacobs' notes, (vol. VIII, p. 211 ff.), and on A. P. IX 412 he observes of the

¹ For no reason except its offensiveness Kaibel rejects this epigram as a forgery suggested by Horace. He seems to have forgotten the *libidines* and *stupra* which shocked Cicero (*supra* p. 35).

whole argument: "prorsus Horatiana philosophia, quae saepe conspicitur in poematiis Philodemi". It is the more remarkable therefore (and perhaps a warning also against a hasty conclusion) that he does not place *Persicos odi* in comparison with our epigram XI 34. Nor does Kaibel mention it. But still more remarkable is the fact that no editor of Horace, so far as I have observed, has made the comparison. That the resemblance has been observed however can scarcely be doubted, and the brief notes of the Didot edition of the Anthology conclude with the laconic "cf. Horatii od. I 38."

The comparison with Philodemus, whatever may be thought of its value as furnishing a point of reference for judging the Roman poet's art, can scarcely be thought of as contributing anything to the understanding of the Horatian ode itself. It does however have a certain bearing upon an old problem concerning the constitution of the first book, which has been revived in recent years by several German critics, and especially by Vollmer in his discussion of the Horatian text tradition.¹ Very briefly stated the point is this: that in view of book II with twenty numbers, III with thirty, IV with fifteen, and recalling also Serm. I with ten, and Epp. I with twenty, it has seemed that the thirty-eight numbers of book I called for some justification or explanation of the number indivisible by five, which has been variously attempted. The solution which Vollmer eventually adopts is, that the book originally consisted of numbers 4-38-35,² and in this form was passed about privately in the circle of Maecenas; that upon its publication in definitive form 1-3 were added, thus producing the numerical dissonance. As an alternative explanation Vollmer suggests the possibility that *Persicos odi* in its present form is incomplete, and that perhaps the remaining fragment and two other poems (which would make up the desired forty) have fallen out.³ The utter

¹ Überlieferungsgeschichte des Horaz. Philol. Supplementband X (1905), p. 280, n. 37.

² The same suggestion is made by Belling, *Liederbücher des Horatius*, Berlin, 1903, p. 115.

³ Luc. Müller (*Odes*, I, p. 128), influenced by similar considerations, had also remarked: "Es erscheint daher sehr glaublich, dass hinter I 38 zwei Oden verloren gegangen sind." See the supplementary note at the end of this paper.

improbability of this hypothesis from the standpoint of our text tradition Vollmer concedes. But from the point of view of aesthetic criticism he holds that I 38 forms a very lame conclusion to book I, in comparison with such manifest epilogues as II 20 and III 30. He thinks it by no means clear that I 38 is a completed poem, and contends that the possibility must be entertained that the myrtle and other preparations of festivity await a Myrtale or a Rhode, who has vanished along with a couple of concluding stanzas. Whatever value may be attached to this speculation—and it need not be taken too seriously—it at least may afford occasion for the observation, that *Persicos odi* has the same formal completeness of structure as the Greek epigram which suggested the theme; that is, a negative thesis of that which is not wished (οὐκ ἐθέλω) followed by a positive antithesis of that which is desired (ἀλλά με). To be sure the erotic touch which Vollmer misses in I 38 is found in the Greek verses, but nevertheless the perfect formal balance of the two compositions entirely excludes the thought of anything more in the Latin lines. It would have pleased Lessing, one may guess, for the purposes of his argument in vindication of Horace—*Rettung des Horaz*—to have observed that the erotic element present in the poem of Philodemus has been entirely eliminated. Not however from any prudery or moral purpose, but because the very structure of the poem (as our comparison has shown) rests upon the treatment of a single item out of the many appurtenances of luxurious festivity which Philodemus names. To have introduced a Pyrrha or a Lyde would have been just as alien to the poet's purpose, as to have brought in the wine, the perfumes, and the music of the scene in Philodemus.

Various meanings have been assigned to this little poem in its position at the end of the first book—either as a quiet contrast to the vehemence of the preceding description of the flight and death of Cleopatra, or as comprehending in the mention of the myrtle of Venus and the vine of Bacchus the conventional themes of lyric verse—but they overlook the natural emphasis which runs through the lines, first negatively—*odi, displicent, mitte*, and then positively—*simplici myrto*, and of these words the essential one, picked out by its position, is the adjective. The truth is, I suspect, that not without deliberate motive, and with full consciousness of the personal significance which usage

attached to the epilogue, the poet has here employed an opportunity to set forth a personal creed, his love of simplicity. It is true that such a definite note of personal expression cannot be attached either to the final epode nor to the last satire of the second book.¹ But with these exceptions all of the remaining books of Horace present well defined conclusions, and at least four of them are expressions of the poet's own consciousness and personality—the biographical characterization of Epp. I 20, the prophecy and the assurance of immortality in Odes II 20 and III 30, and the polemical defence of his literary position in Serm. I 10. One cannot therefore easily escape the feeling that a final poem by the very fact of its position may have some such meaning, and that to seek it is merely to follow the guidance of the poet's own practice. And what is more natural than that here at the end of the first offering of lyric poems Horace should set down his general profession of faith, his creed of life and of letters. For the former he has to be sure given indications in earlier poems of the first book, and it is not without interest to compare with our thirty-eighth the similar antithesis between luxury and frugality which is contained in the third and fourth stanzas of I 31 (*Quid dedicatum*).

Premant Calenam falce quibus dedit
fortuna vitem,

* * * * *

Me pascunt olivae,
me cichorea levesque malvae.

But there was more to be conveyed and in a more significant place. Horace has laid before his readers a book of lyric poems which did not follow the stylistic traditions either of Greek models, or of such Roman predecessors as had assayed a similar task. "In translating Greek lyric," as Professor Shorey says (Odes, xviii), "the student must ransack his dictionary for terms rich enough to represent the luxuriance of the Greek compound epithets." Something of this same search, either in the pages of Pacuvius or in the resources of invention, the earlier Roman lyric poets had made, from the bolder efforts of Laevius (*trisaeclesenex*, *dulciorelocus*, *pudoricolorem*, etc.) to the more sober attempts of Catullus in the same direction

¹ And for the benefit of adherents to the pentad or decade theory it should be noted that these two exceptions (disregarding I 38) are found in books with a total which is not a multiple of 5 or 10.

(*sagittiferos, septemgeminus, lasarpiciferis*, etc.).¹ Horace in conscious contrast to such experiments, and true to his principle of restraint and Latin purity had not sought to vie with the gorgeous colors of his Greek models. His medium was, so to speak, black and white. "In considering the means with which he worked, the first thing that strikes us is the simplicity, not to say the poverty of his poetical vocabulary" (Shorey, *ibid.*). A certain amount of poverty there doubtless was, both inherent in the Latin vocabulary, and in the poet's own gifts and temperament, but no small part of it arises from a theory of style which repudiated ornament, and prized restraint and low lights. The expression of this principle, consonant with his personal taste and philosophy of life, we may suspect that he has given here in slight and transparent allegory.

G. L. HENDRICKSON.

NEW HAVEN.

¹ I use the compound epithet (as suggested by Shorey) merely as an illustration, not as embracing the whole theory of style.

[Supplementary note to p. 38 extr. above.]

The protagonist of the doctrine of decades and pentads in the arrangement of the poems of Horace is Belling, in the work referred to above (p. 38). The same scholar (in other publications on Tibullus, Virgil, and Propertius) has pursued his principle through practically all of the Augustan poets, and I fear has succeeded rather in discrediting the kernel of truth from which he starts—it was indicated in all essentials by Kiessling in *Phil. Untersuch.* II, p. 73—than in establishing his own theories. Belling dedicates his book *piis manibus Adolphi Kiessling*, but the spirit of that vigorous scholar can have little joy in the subtleties of his over-zealous disciple. The decade theory is therefore recent, but the doctrine appeared in practical application more than a century before. For in 1778, in the January number of the *Gentleman's Magazine* (Vol. 48, p. 38) there appeared "two additional Odes to the First Book of Horace, lately discovered in the Palatine Library, communicated by Gaspar Pallavacini, Sub-Librarian, with a Commentary." They are numbered I 39 ad Julium Florum, and I 40 ad Librum suum. The discoverer professes to have found them upon a single sheet "*laceratam excerptamque ex aliqua editione Horatiana . . . et forsitan prima*", and he adds "*Chartam ipsam in Archivis tutissime recondidi*". The readers of the *Gentleman's Magazine* seem to have taken the poems in good faith, and in the subsequent issues of the year contribute a number of translations. Other echoes of the discovery in the literature of the time seem very scarce, and indeed it is not probable that English classical scholars ever took the new odes seriously. However they were

reprinted in the same year in the ambitious edition of Jani (Leipz. 1778), and they appear in the old Teubner text of Jahn through the successive editions down to the sixth (revised by Th. Schmid in 1857), where they are placed after I 38, each headed by the words *carmen spurium*. Meyer also included them in his *Anthologia Latina* I, p. 41. English editors seem to have been less hospitable. Anthon in his first edition made them accessible to American scholars, but they are omitted from later issues. Jahn cites a monograph of Iul. Bernh. Ballenstedt, "Über zwei neuerlich entdeckte dem Horaz zugeschriebene Oden," Hannover, 1781, and the British Museum Catalogue contains the entry, "A dissertation concerning two Odes of [or rather ascribed to] Horace [marked as Carm. Lib. I, Ode 39-40] which have been discovered in the Palatine Library at Rome", London, 1789. Mitscherlich assigns to the year 1760 an edition of Prague containing the new odes, which was published without date. If this assignment were correct it might be argued that the forgery is of the Renaissance period (as Lucian Müller, *Odes* I, p. 128, says). But the truth about the Prague edition is probably given more accurately by the British Museum Catalogue, which contains the following title and comment: "Q. Horatii Flacci Opera omnia, ad exemplar Bentlei excusa (nunc insertis duabus odibus novissime repertis aucta, addita quoque de harum odarum inventione epistola G. Pallavacini). 2. tom. Prague, 1775? -80. Privately printed. The second title page, with the leaf containing the letter of Pallavacini, and the two newly discovered odes, inserted between pp. 83 and 84, and here paged 83 i-iv, were printed and added to this edition in 1780." As to the identity of the discoverer a suspicion may be entertained, though I presume it could be resolved either positively or negatively by any one in communication with the records of the Vatican library. It is noteworthy in this connection that Mitscherlich, and the title cited by L. Müller from a sale catalogue, both insert the word "principis" before the name "G. Pallavacini". My reason for suspecting the genuineness of the communication to the Gentleman's Magazine arose in the first instance from the character of the communication itself, and was confirmed by Fea's remark in the preface to his edition (Rome, 1811, I, p. xxxiii) upon the discovery of the odes: "Quisquis ille primus fuerit tanto honore dignus, is certe impostor fuit putidissimus: nullibi enim vel in MSS. Vaticanis, vel in aliis Romanis eas reperire potui". Fea at any rate was in Rome (born in 1753) and in position to ascertain the truth.

The first two lines of the "fortieth" ode (ad librum suum) will perhaps suffice to illustrate the method of fabrication:

Dulci libello nemo sodalium
forsan meorum charior extitit;

which is of course an adaption of the words and rhythm of *Pompei meorum prime sodalium*, with situation and hints drawn from Epp. I 20 (*carus eris*, etc.). In fact the workmanship throughout is so crassly imitative, that one can scarcely repress the suspicion that the Italian "Sub-Librarian" was merely the mask of some Oxford or Cambridge wag, playing upon the heavy respectability of classical studies as aired in

the *Gentleman's Magazine*. Of the explanatory notes which accompany the original publication a correspondent of February, 1778 (p. 87), says: "they are paltry in the extreme". But they are better than paltry, they are ludicrous, and seem in fact meant as a parody upon the pedantries of annotation, e. g. "Ex hac Ode (40) luce clarius extat, hunc primum librum primo in publicum prodiisse." But the jester (if my suspicion is right) seems to have carried off his hoax successfully so far as his immediate audience was concerned, and in maintaining a place, even though suspected, in sober editions for nearly a century he doubtless succeeded far beyond his expectation. I have set forth the matter at such length merely as an amusing curiosity. The only serious reason that justifies attention to the subject is the fact that 40 apparently seemed a more reasonable number of odes for the first book, and that the 38th seemed an inadequate epilogue.

III.—RHETORICAL ELEMENTS IN LIVY'S DIRECT SPEECHES.

PART II.

Following Part I of this article (A. J. P., XXXVIII 125 ff.), in which the more important Figures of Thought employed by Livy in sixty-seven of the direct speeches were examined and discussed, the same procedure will here be followed with respect to Figures of Expression, and results for the entire study will be given as to Livy's usage, passing from the earlier to the later parts of his work.

ANAPHORA.

This figure is frequently discussed by ancient rhetoricians, and, with its subdivisions (see below), is variously denominated.¹ Likewise, the grace, life, and energy of style gained by its employment are recognized.² That anaphora serves well

¹ Phoebe. Rhet. Gr., III, 46: *ἐπαναφορά δέ ἐστιν, ἥ καὶ ἀναφορά, πλείονων στίχων ἢ κώλων ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν τοῦ λόγου μερῶν ἀρχή*. Donat. Gr. Lat., IV, 398: "Anaphora est relatio eiusdem verbi per principia versuum plurimorum"; see also Diomed. Gr. Lat., I, p. 445; Beda, RLM., 609, 10. The author of Ad Her., IV, 13, 19 uses *repetitio* as a general designation, "repetitio est, cum continenter ab uno atque eodem uerbo in rebus similibus et diuersis principia sumuntur." Quint., who (IX, 3, 28-34) discusses the emphasis gained by the addition or repetition of words, introduces (§ 30) an example of anaphora (Cic. In Cat., I, 2) without using the term.

² Demetr. Rhet. Gr., III, 294, 7: *χαριεντίζεται δέ ποτε καὶ ἐξ ἀναφορᾶς*. Ad Her. (I. c.): "Haec exornatio cum multum uenustatis habet tum grauitatis et acrimoniae plurimum. Quare uidetur esse adhibenda et ad ornandam et ad exaugendam orationem"; Quint., IX, 3, 28: "Illud est acrius genus [schematum], quod non tantum in ratione positum est loquendi, sed ipsis sensibus cum gratiam tum etiam vires accommodat. Ex quibus primum sit, quod fit adiectione"; Volkmann (op. cit.), p. 467: "Heftig und mit Nachdruck fangen mehrere Glieder der Rede nach einander mit denselben Worten an"; Haupt (op. cit.), p. 48: "Will der Schriftsteller irgend einen Begriff eine Beziehung oder eine bestimmte Nüance des Gedankens hervorheben, so liegt zunächst nichts näher, als eine Wiederholung des bezeichnenden Wortes." Palmer, The Use of Anaphora, etc. (Yale Diss. 1915), analyzes the means by which anaphora imparts emphasis, and concludes (p. 81) that the amplification of a general truth is one of the principal purposes served by the use of the figure.

the aims of rhetorical ornamentation is evidenced by the great frequency with which it occurs in the works of orators and writers of conscious rhetorical purpose—Demosthenes, Cicero, Tacitus, Quintilian. It is used very freely by Livy, and constitutes a conspicuous feature of the speeches,¹ in which, in those under review, I have counted three hundred seventy-six examples.² Some of the more noteworthy instances will here be given, with a consideration of usage by individual speakers.

Emphasis is most striking when the repeated element is made up of two words, especially if the anaphora is four- or fivefold, as in 28, 27, 12 *qui mihi ne hodie quidem scire videmini . . . quid facinoris in me, quid in patriam parentesque ac liberos*

¹ Moczyński (op. cit.), p. 22: "Usitatissima apud Livium est repetitionis figura, qua in orationibus potissimum vis quaedam et gravitas efficitur"; Petzke (op. cit.), p. 55: "Livius anaphoram orationibus, eisque directis, saepius immiscuit; qua re splendorem ac copiam verborum maxime videtur respexisse"; Haupt, p. 51: "In ihr [Anapher] hat sich das rhetorische Moment der Sprache am deutlichsten ausgeprägt, jener Sprache, welche auf dem Forum im lebendigen Streite der Parteien, in den grossen Staatsreden der Tribunen und Konsuln vornehmlich alle die Mittel sich ausgestalten musste, Deshalb tritt namentlich in den Reden des Livius die Kraft dieser Anordnung recht anschaulich zu Tage"; Steele, *Anaphora and Chiasmus in Livy, T.A.P.A.*, xxxii, p. 185: "Anaphora, emphasizing by repetition, is one of the most marked rhetorical features of the Speeches"; Norden, I, p. 237: "Von den Redefiguren [bei Livius] ist häufig nur die natürlichste und wirksamste, die Anapher."

² In the speeches are found a large proportion of Livy's conditional statements which form anaphora; verbs and nouns are less frequent. Many examples are cited by Steele (cf. note 1 above) in his detailed study. As by him, so here consideration is given only to verbal anaphora (repetition of the same or closely similar word in successive statements), as opposed to clausal anaphora (repetition of groups of words in parallel construction). The definition of anaphora by Ad Her. (see note 1, p. 44) is the generally accepted one prior to Nägelsbach (op. cit. p. 639), who would widen it to include "die Wiederkehr derselben Wortfolge entweder in dem nämlichen Satze oder in verschiedenen". This latter phenomenon is ordinarily called *concinntas*, which Nägelsbach (p. 642) regards as the genus of which both anaphora and chiasmus are species. Jahn (Blätt. f. bayer. Gymn., III, p. 272 ff.) rejects this enlarged use of the term anaphora, which may properly be used only as the opposite of epiphora (repetition at the end of successive statements), whereas Nägelsbach has in mind members of clauses which correspond logically, and which at the same time are so arranged that they correspond in order.

vestros, quid in deos sacramenti testes, quid adversus auspicia, . . . quid adversus morem militiae disciplinamque maiorum, quid adversus summi imperii maiestatemque ausi sitis; 7, 40, 8 si cui genus, si cui sua virtus, si cui etiam maiestas, si cui honores subdere spiritus potuerunt; 25, 6, 18 ne qua spes, ne qua occasio abolendae ignominiae, ne qua placandae civium irae, ne qua denique bene moriendi sit; 32, 21, 13 quid ita passus est Eretriam Carystumque capi? quid ita tot Thessaliae urbes? quid ita Locridem Phocidemque? quid ita nunc Elatiam oppugnari patitur? 9, 9, 18 Samnitibus sponsores nos sumus rei satis locupletes in id, quod nostrum est, in id, quod praestare possumus, corpora nostra et animos: in haec saeviant, in haec ferrum, in haec iras acuant. In most cases the anaphora, as indicative of less excitement, is two- or threefold, e. g. 40, 10, 10 pro isto Romani stant, pro isto omnes urbes tuo imperio liberatae, pro isto Macedones qui pace Romana gaudent; 45, 38, 11 tot de Gallis triumphi, tot de Hispanis, tot de Poenis? 6, 40, 13 si quis patricius, si quis Claudius diceret; 30, 14, 10 etiamsi non civis Carthaginensis esset, etiamsi non patrem eius imperatorem hostium viderent; 3, 17, 6; 6, 40, 7; 8, 4, 3; 21, 13, 3; 21, 44, 5; 28, 41, 11; 30, 14, 10; 34, 6, 14.

Of pronouns, interrogatives (under which particles are included) are found most frequently,¹ with a total of fifty examples. By repetition the speaker draws attention item by item to details and contrasted phases of the subject under presentation, as in 28, 27, 12 (given above), or in 9, 1, 7 quid ultra tibi, Romane, quid foederi, quid diis arbitris foederis debeo? quem tibi tuarum irarum, quem meorum suppliciorum iudicem feram? 9, 9, 16 quid enim vobiscum . . . quid cum populo Romano actum est? quis vos appellare potest, quis se a vobis dicere deceptum? 28, 29, 4 horret animus referre, quid crediderint homines, quid speraverint, quid optaverint. Notable for variety of forms is 44, 22, 8 sunt qui . . . ubi castra locanda sint sciant, quae loca praesidiis occupanda, quando aut quo saltu intranda Macedonia, ubi horrea ponenda, qua terra mari subvehantur commeatus, quando cum hoste manus conserendae,

¹ This result, while differing from Livy's usage as a whole (cf. Steele, p. 163, "Interrogative forms are less numerous than are relatives"), is due to the great preponderance of rhetorical questions in the direct speeches; see above Part I, p. 135 ff.

quando quiesse sit melius. In 41, 24, 17 *quid* introduces four complete sentences, *quid hoc adversus Romana foedera est? quid rem parvam et apertam magnam et suspectam facimus? quid vanos tumultus ciemus? quid . . . suspectos alios invisosque efficimus?* Direct disjunctives are illustrated by 5, 3, 6 *utrum enim defenditis an in pugnatis plebem? utrum militantium adversarii estis an causam agitis?* 28, 43, 13 *utrum maior aliqua nunc in Africa calamitas accepta est . . . ? an maiores nunc sunt exercitus in Africa . . . ? an aetas mea tunc maturior bello gerendo fuit . . . ? an cum Carthaginensi hoste in Hispania quam in Africa bellum geri aptius est?* The use of other particles may be exemplified by the following: 34, 6, 17 *cur pecunias reddimus privatis? cur publica praesenti pecunia locamus? cur servi . . . non emuntur? cur privati non damus remiges . . . ?* 34, 5, 9 *nonne id agmen, quo obruta haec urbs esset, matronae averterunt? nonne matronae consensu omnium [aurum] in publicum contulerunt? nonne . . . viduarum pecuniae adjuverunt aerarium?* 3, 67, 10 *ecquando unam urbem habere, ecquando communem hanc esse patriam licebit?* 38, 47, 12 *quotiens agri eorum vastati sint, quotiens praedae abactae, referant.* Relatives and indefinites are well represented, in most cases by two-, but also by three- and fourfold anaphora, as in 44, 22, 12 *ab his qui intersunt . . . qui hostem, qui temporum opportunitatem vident, qui in eodem velut navigio participes sunt periculi;* 6, 41, 2; 39, 36, 13; 21, 41, 8 *qui iussus ab consule nostro praesidium deduxit ab Eryce, qui graves inpositas victis Carthaginensibus leges accepit, qui . . . stipendium populo Romano dare pactus est;* 45, 24, 12 *quidquid Rhodiorum virorum ac feminarum est . . . quidquid publici quidquid privati est;* 38, 17, 11; 38, 47, 6; 38, 48, 4; 41, 24, 11; 45, 24, 12. Sometimes the repeated pronouns are of different cases, e. g. 10, 8, 5; 21, 40, 5; 27, 13, 3; 39, 16, 13; 40, 10, 9. The most notable examples of demonstratives are: 5, 54, 7 *hic Capitolium est, . . . hic, cum augurato liberaretur Capitolium, Iuventus Terminusque maximo gaudio patrum vestrorum moveri se non passi;* *hic Vestae ignes, hic ancilia caelo demissa, hic omnes propitii manentibus vobis dii;* 9, 34, 3 *haec est eadem familia, . . . haec, adversus quam tribunicium auxilium vobis conparastis; haec, propter quam duo exercitus Aventinum*

inseditis; haec, quae faenebres leges, haec, quae agrarias inpugnavit, haec conubia patrum et plebis interruptit, haec plebi ad curules magistratus iter obsaepsit. Personal and possessives yield fourteen examples, of which the larger number and most emphatic are, as we should expect in the speeches, pronouns of the second person, 7, 13, 10 cupimus . . . te duce vincere, tibi lauream insignem deferre, tecum triumphantes urbem inire, tuum sequentes curram Iovis optimi maximi templum gratantes ovantesque adire; 10, 8, 9; 23, 5, 14; 38, 48, 7; 40, 15, 10. Pronouns of the first person are found 3, 67, 11 adversus nos Aventinum capitur, adversus nos occupatur mons . . . in nos viri, in nos armati estis; 28, 28, 11 quid? si ego morerer, mecum expiratura res publica, mecum casurum imperium populi Romani erat? 42, 41, 13 cum mei regni, meae ditionis essent.

Conditional particles appear thirty-seven times, their emphatic repetition enabling the speaker to enlarge on his theme by holding various facts and contingencies before his audience, as in 7, 40, 6 si meminisse vultis, non vos in Samnio nec in Volscis, . . . si illos colles, quos cernitis, patriae vestrae esse, si hunc exercitum civium vestrorum, si me consulem vestrum; 9, 9, 6 si spopondissemus urbem hanc relicturum populum Romanum si, incensurum, si magistratus, si senatum, si leges non habiturum, si sub regibus futurum. Noteworthy is 4, 5, 5, in which Canuleius states with increasing emphasis sundry conditions, the concession of which alone will induce the plebeians to accompany the consuls to war: si conubiis redditis unam hanc civitatem tandem facitis, si coalescere, si iungi miscerique vobis privatis necessitudinibus possunt, si spes, si aditus ad honores datur, si in consortio, si in societate rei publicae esse, si in vicem annuis magistratibus parere atque imperitare licet. Speakers find it necessary to give negative expression to their own purpose, will or policy, or to those of the opposition, hence negatives are freely used, and with nearly every part of speech. I have collected fifty-six examples, some quite extended, as non 5, 6, 17; 9, 1, 9; 28, 42, 6; 40, 10, 3; nec 9, 34, 22; 38, 49, 8 necubi notis sibi latebris delitescerent latrones Thraces, ne quid sarcinarum raperetur, ne quod iumentum ex tanto agmine abstraheretur, ne quis vulneraretur, ne ex vulnere vir fortis ac strenuus Q. Minucius moreretur; neu 25, 38, 6; nemo 4, 5, 6. Not infrequently various negatives are combined: 4, 4, 11; 5, 6, 8; 23, 9, 5; 37, 53, 18. Of other parts of speech

extended illustration is unnecessary. Adjectives total twenty-one instances, and those expressing quality are few. Note 23, 5, 10 itaque communem vos hanc cladem . . . credere, Campani, oportet, communem patriam tuendam arbitrari esse; 38, 17, 7 mollia corpora, molles, ubi ira consedit, animos sol pulvis sitis . . . prosternunt; 40, 15, 4 ut indignus te patre, indignus omnibus videar. Adjectives indicating quantity are more numerous, but on the whole a relatively small group:¹ tantus, 45, 39, 5; multus 42, 41, 11; quot 26, 41, 10; tot 30, 30, 7. Nouns in anaphora occur only six times, 6, 41, 4; 7, 35, 3; 21, 10, 10; 34, 4, 9; 36, 7, 18; 45, 38, 7. Adverbs, mostly of time or place, seventeen times. Verbs (fifteen examples) are best illustrated in 9, 8, 9; 25, 6, 22; 40, 9, 8. Prepositions are numerous: note sine 7, 13, 6; per 30, 12, 13; post 28, 43, 14. Conjunctions, as quod, quia, cum, ut, etc., are used twenty times, while temporal dum (28, 44, 10), comparative quam (5, 51, 7), and emphatic correlatives,² as seu (6, 41, 9), aut (32, 21, 15), partim (42, 41, 2) add forty-one instances.

Subdivisions of anaphora should be considered, such as the immediate repetition³ of the same word with emphasis or vehemence, 30, 14, 6 non est, non—mihi crede—tantum ab hostibus armatis aetati nostrae periculi, quantum ab circumfusus undique voluptatibus; likewise six instances in which there is a repetition of the last word, or some prominent word, at the beginning of the next sentence—frequently after intervening words and with an adjunct idea:⁴ 21, 44, 7 et, inde si

¹ I have not disregarded such examples as omnia praemia ab se, omnes honores sperare, as does Steele (l. c.) on the ground that such anaphora is dependent. For had no emphasis been intended, the writer would ordinarily have connected the nouns without repeating the common modifier, or would have inserted a conjunction, as in 21, 43, 3 maiora vincula maioresque necessitates.

² Omitted, of course, are stereotyped correlatives, as nec . . . nec, sive . . . sive, alii . . . alii, etc., where the first member requires the addition of a corresponding term.

³ Technically called *παλλογία* (Zon. Rhet. Gr., III, 165, 24; Anon. Rhet. Gr., III, 182, 14); also *ἐπιζευξίς* (Herod. Rhet. Gr., III, 99, 22). Latin writers use the term *iteratio* (Aq. Rom. RLM., 31, 12) or *geminatio* (Carmen de Fig. RLM., 66, 76); cf. Quint., IX, 3, 28. This figure is frequent in Demosthenes, Cicero, and the Greek and Latin poets.

⁴ According to Quint. (IX, 3, 29) this kind is more effective than when the repeated word follows immediately, "similis geminationis post

decessero, in Africam transcendes. transcendes autem?¹ transcendisse dico; 22, 59, 18 rediere Romam quondam remissi a Pyrrho sine pretio captivi; sed rediere cum legatis . . . redeam ego in patriam trecentis nummis non aestimatus civis? 22, 60, 15 liberi atque incolumes desiderate patriam; immo desiderate, dum patria est; 26, 13, 11 postremo ad moenia ipsa et ad portas accessit, Romam se adepturum eis, nisi omitterent Capuam, ostendit: non omiserunt; 5, 4, 10 et [bellum] perfici quam primum oportet. perficietur autem, si urgemus obsessos; 32, 21, 13 cur igitur nostrum ille auxilium absens petit potius quam praesens nos . . . tueatur? nos dico?

To sum up: the use of anaphora by individual speakers ranges from twenty-three examples by Demetrius (125 lines) to none by Decius Mus (53), Minucius (45), or the Saguntine embassy (55). It appears most frequently in speeches which show emphasis by vigorous amplification, and least frequently in those of simple progressive statement. Relative usage may be seen from the following: one example in every five and one-half lines (Demetrius); in seven (Torquatus); in eight (Postumius); in nine (Camillus, Hannibal, 21, 23-24, Sempronius, Scipio, 28, 27-29); in ten (Appius Claudius Crassus, Manlius, Perseus).

CHIASMUS.

Various collections showing Livy's use of this common figure² have already been made,³ but none with special refer-

aliquam interiectionem repetitio est, sed paulo etiam vehementior". It is defined by Ad Her. (IV, 28, 38) as *conduplicatio*, whose forcefulness is thus described: "Vehementer auditorem commouet eiusdem redintegratio uerbi et uulnus maius efficit in contrario causae, quasi aliquod telum saepius perueniat in eandem partem corporis." More frequently used is the term *ἀναδίπλωσις* (Zon. Rhet. Gr., III, 165, 29), or *ἐπανάληψις* (Phoeb. Rhet. Gr., III, 46, 29; Lupus, RLM., 8, 1).

¹ When the repetition, as here, is explanatory or corrective, it is called *ἐπιδιόρθωσις* (Tib. Rhet. Gr., III, 62, 17), *ἐπιτίμησις* (Alex. Rhet. Gr., III, 40, 21), *correctio* (Carmen de Fig. RLM., 69, 151).

² Grammatical chiasmus only, a reversal of the order of corresponding pairs, is here considered. For chiasmus used in logical expression of thought, cf. Nägelsbach (p. 634), and for definitions and illustrations of each type from the rhetoricians, see Steele, *Chiasmus in Sallust, etc.*, J.H.U. Diss., 1891, p. 3 ff. See also Volkmann, p. 488.

³ See especially Steele (T.A.P.A., xxxii, pp. 166-185); Kühnast, p. 326 f.; Moczyński, p. 25. Haupt (pp. 56-84) discusses a few cases illustrating the figure both in the simple sentence and in extended periods.

ence to the speeches. In those examined I have noted numerous instances not elsewhere cited, especially examples in which, although the construction of corresponding pairs is not strictly parallel, the emphasis is quite obvious as in 5, 4, 7 *an ut aecum censens militia semenstri solidum te stipendium accipere?* 7, 13, 6 *priusquam expertus nos esses, de nobis ita desperasti*; 40, 10, 9 *qui tuam senectutem obligatam et obnoxiam adolescentiae suae esse aequum censet*.

The general emphasis gained by chiasmus arises from juxtaposing, or separating terms, and so contrasting them by a reversal of the normal arrangement. The pairs most frequently so treated by Livy's speakers are made up of nouns with verbs. Note three pairs in 3, 68, 2 *visite agros . . . vastatos, praedam abigi, fumare incensa passim tecta*; 5, 6, 2; 26, 41, 15; 37, 53, 13 *rex Asiae . . . filiam suam in matrimonium mihi dabat; restituebat extemplo civitates, . . . spem magnam in posterum . . . faciebat*; 39, 36, 13 *qui . . . multitudinem exciverant, qui expugnaverant maritima oppida, . . . caedem principum fecerant*; 44, 38, 9 *longo itinere fatigatum et onere fessum, madentem sudore*; 45, 22, 6 *Athenae oppugnatae et Graecia in servitutem petita et adiutus Hannibal pecunia*. Two pairs are far more common (sixty-five examples). Illustrations are: 6, 18, 7 *ostendite modo bellum: pacem habebitis*; 22, 59, 6 *tunc demum pacti sumus pretium, . . . arma . . . hosti tradidimus*; 5, 6, 4 *tempestatibus captandis et observando tempore*; 34, 6, 17 *aut decrevit senatus aut populus iussit*; 40, 10, 1 *exsecrare nunc cupiditatem regni, et furias fraternas concita*; 26, 41, 21; 45, 22, 11 *socios iuvare et . . . capessere bella*. Adjectives, adverbs, participles, and prepositional phrases are occasionally combined with verbs, as in 22, 39, 1 *si aut collegam, . . . tui similem, L. Aemili, haberes aut tu collegae tui esses similis*; 37, 53, 7 *in aliis rebus cessisse intra finem iuris mei cuilibet videri malim, quam nimis pertinaciter in obtinendo eo tetendisse*; 4, 3, 6 *cur . . . negent se manibus temperaturos violaturosque denuntient?* 45, 23, 3 *causam fortasse diceremus apud victorem, quem ad modum apud vos dicimus*.

Livy's speakers use chiasmus frequently with emphatic contrast of pronouns, particularly personal and possessive, of the first and second person. See 3, 67, 10 *victi nos aequiore animo*

quiescimus quam vos victores; 4, 4, 12; 4, 5, 2; 5, 54, 3 etsi minus iniuriae vestrae quam meae calamitatis meminisse iuvat; 6, 40, 8; 23, 9, 8; 28, 29, 3; 30, 30, 8; 30, 30, 18; 45, 23, 16. Observe the striking order in 7, 30, 23 proinde ut aut de vestris futuris sociis . . . aut nusquam ullis futuris nobis consulite. Noteworthy is 7, 40, 10 with pronouns in the means as also in the extremes, ergo vos prius in me strinxeritis ferrum quam in vos ego; also 23, 5, 7, in which there is emphatic contrast of three pairs, but without corresponding construction in any: itaque non iuvetis nos in bello oportet, Campani, sed paene bellum pro nobis suscipiatis. The reverse order, in which pronouns are separated while members of other pairs are juxtaposed, may be seen in 10, 8, 4 non ut vos, Appi, vestro loco pellant, sed ut adiuvent vos homines plebei; 26, 41, 21 nam et [illi] deseruntur ab sociis, ut prius ab Celtiberis nos; 40, 10, 9 quoted above. Pronouns are used in chiasmus with nouns, as in 6, 40, 11 uti L. Sextium illum atque hunc Gaium Licinium consules, . . . videas? 22, 29, 6 palam ferente Hannibale ab se Minucium, se ab Fabio victum; 22, 39, 8 belli hoc genus, hostem hunc ignoro; 28, 41, 4 nisi . . . aut illud bellum huic, aut victoria illa, etc. Occasionally the possessive is found opposed to the genitive of the noun, e. g. in 7, 13, 5 deum benignitate, felicitate tua populique Romani; 45, 23, 1 deum benignitate et virtute vestra; closely related to these are the following: 28, 42, 20 quam compar consilium tuum parentis tui consilio sit, reputa; 3, 68, 5 non vestra virtute . . . sed auxilio alieno.

Nouns are well represented; note three pairs in 23, 5, 11 Poenus hostis . . . ab ultimis terrarum oris, freto Oceani Herculisque columnis; 39, 16, 8; 41, 24, 8; three pairs made up of nouns and adjectives: 44, 38, 9 cited above; 44, 39, 1. Two pairs are frequent, as in 3, 67, 6 discordia ordinum . . . patrum ac plebis certamina; 5, 52, 9; 8, 4, 4; 9, 9, 6; 9, 11, 5; 28, 27, 5; 28, 43, 5; 28, 43, 12; 28, 43, 18; 28, 48, 2; 30, 31, 2; 38, 48, 7; 39, 16, 1; 41, 23, 12; 41, 24, 3. Nouns with prepositional phrases are found in 37, 54, 26 et aliae [civitates] prius cum Philippo, et cum Pyrrho Tarentini.

Adverbs arranged chiastically are rare: 21, 44, 4 ad supplicium depoposcerunt me ducem primum, deinde vos omnes;

34, 2, 7; 36, 17, 13 a Philippo ante nunc ab Aetolis; 39, 37, 15 parum est victis, quod victoribus satis est. Only the following clauses were found, a relatively small group: 5, 54, 3; 27, 13, 5 omitto ea, quibus gloriari potestis; cuius et ipsius pudere ac paenitere vos oportet, referam; 28, 29, 4; 30, 30, 21; 32, 21, 5; 34, 4, 16; 39, 36, 13 f.

The total number of examples under review is 166. No specific statement as to desirable frequency is available, but considering the number and extent of the speeches examined we may conclude that Livy here kept in mind rhetorical precept (cf. Quint., IX, 3, 100)—that figures to be embellishments must be used judiciously and in moderation. Individual speakers showing greatest relative frequency in usage are: Calavius, Capitolinus, P. Scipio (26, 41), Hannibal (30, 30), Q. Fabius (22, 39), Camillus, Astymedes.

PARONOMASIA.

This figure belongs to a general class, which, by some resemblance, opposition or equality, appeals to the ear and attention of the hearer.¹ In paronomasia the same or related word, or a word similar in sound, is purposely used in a different sense or construction, to give an antithetical force to the sentence.

¹ See Quint., IX, 3, 66; Schem. Dian. RLM., 75, 12. The term *παρονομασία*, not used by Aristotle, is met frequently in the Rhet. Gr. (see Spengel's index). In Latin it is denominatio (Schem. Dian., l. c.), adnominatio, or adfectio; see Rufin. RLM., 51, 23; Ad Her., IV, 21-22. Quint. (l. c.) confines the figure principally to a repetition of words with change in case or tense, or to instances in which the same word is repeated with changed or added meaning. Word plays, where the point consists in conscious changes in sound, quantity of vowels, prepositional compounds, etc., frequent in Plautus, Terence, Cicero, and Seneca Rhetor, are quite rare in Livy. Kühnast (p. 330) treats under iteratio and limits the figure to an arrangement of words derived from the same stem and similar in form. Repetition with change, even in Livy, is of wide application, frequently the same word being repeated with variation only in case or tense. Unless emphasis is clearly intentional all such occurrences are here neglected, since they must be regarded as accidental, unavoidable without artificiality, or at least in harmony with a principle common to all languages—the disposition to continue and enlarge an idea by some form of repetition. For a more detailed treatment of paronomasia, see I. M. Casanowicz, *Paronomasia in the Old Testament*, Boston, 1894 (J. H. U. Diss.).

It is relatively infrequent in the historians.¹ To examples from Livy already collected,² many additions are here made, with omission of such as are involved in anaphora and in the use of correlatives.

Words of the same stem are repeated in 3, 68, 8 *sedemus desides domi*; 4, 4, 11 *nec eodem itinere eat*; 5, 4, 1 *de ipsa condicione dicere*; 5, 5, 2 *agrum non coluit, et culta evastata sunt bello*; 5, 6, 10 *inexpugnabiles [urbes] . . . tempus ipsum vincit atque expugnat, sicut Veios expugnabit*; 5, 54, 7 *ubi quondam capite humano invento responsum est eo loco caput rerum . . . fore*; 9, 9, 15 *ut, . . . et nostrum exercitum eadem, quae inpedierat, fortuna expediret, vanam victoriam vanior inritam faceret pax*; 21, 43, 14 *cum exercitu tirone, . . . ignoto adhuc duci suo ignorantique ducem*; 21, 43, 18 *adversus ignotos inter se ignorantesque*; 22, 39, 5 *adversus Hannibalem . . . pugnandum tibi sit, Varro dux . . . te sit oppugnaturus*; 25, 38, 5 *me . . . curis insomniisque agitant et excitant saepe somno*; 29, 17, 2 *magis indignemini bonis ac fidelibus sociis tam indignas iniurias . . . fieri*; 30, 12, 18 *amore captivae victor captus*; 34, 5, 1; 37, 53, 7 *in obtinendo eo tetendisse*; 37, 54, 6 *ut nos liberi etiam aliorum libertatis causam agamus*; 38, 17, 13 *est generosius, in sua quidquid sede gignitur; insitum alienae terrae . . . degenerat*; 38, 49, 8 *necubi notis sibi latebris delitescerent latrones*; 40, 8, 16 *neque vos . . . eventus detertere a vecordi discordia potuit*; 41, 24, 15; 42, 42, 8. In two cases we have emphatic change of prepositional compound: 31, 29, 15 *eiusdem linguae homines . . . causae diiungunt coniunguntque*; 40, 12, 6 *quae obest potius quam prodest*.

More frequently the same word is used, but as involving an emphatic change in some particular, e. g. in construction: 6, 18, 8 *ego quidem nulli vestrum deero: ne fortuna mea desit*; 6, 18, 13 *experimini modo et vestram felicitatem et me . . . feliciter expertum: minore negotio qui imperet patribus imponetis, quam qui resisterent imperantibus imposuistis*; 9, 4, 9; 9, 4, 14; 21, 40, 11 *decurit . . . deos . . . committere ac profligare bellum, nos . . . commissum ac profligatum conficere*; 25, 38, 15 *ne*

¹ Draeger, *Syntax und Stil des Tacitus* (3 ed.), p. 110; Lupus, *Der Sprachgebrauch des Cornelius Nepos*, Berlin, 1876, p. 199.

Petzke, p. 72 f.; Moczyński, p. 22.

. . . ipsi oppugnati castra sua ultro oppugnemus. audeamus, quod credi non potest ausuros nos; 26, 41, 9; 27, 13, 3 quos vincendo et victos sequendo; 28, 39, 2 bellum propter nos suscepistis, susceptum . . . geritis; 28, 40, 14 vincere ego prohibui Hannibalem, ut a vobis . . . vinci posset; 36, 7, 14; 37, 54, 18 nec terra mutata mutavit genus; 40, 9, 15 si deprehensos . . . ad te deducerem, rem pro manifesto haberes: fatentes pro deprehensis habe. Change in case: 6, 40, 18 parum est, si, cuius pars tua nulla adhuc fuit, in partem eius venis, nisi partem petendo totum traxeris? 8, 4, 8; 9, 9, 11; 9, 34, 1; 10, 8, 5 cuius tam dictatoris magister equitum quam magistri equitum dictator esse potes; 21, 10, 4 si ex bellis bella serendo; 21, 40, 4; 22, 39, 1; 28, 28, 15; 31, 29, 16 hoc eodem loco iidem homines de eiusdem Philippi pace . . . iisdem improbantibus eam pacem Romanis; 32, 21, 29; 38, 17, 8; 39, 37, 9; 40, 13, 3. Change in tense: 23, 9, 8 valeant preces apud te meae, sicut pro te hodie valuerunt; 30, 31, 5 ius fasque dederunt et . . . dant et dabunt; 34, 4, 16; 40, 9, 14 possunt quidem omnia audere qui hoc ausi sunt.

The simplest form of paronomasia is the so-called σχῆμα ἐτυμολογικόν, involving repetition of the same or a kindred stem in dependent relation.¹ It is rare in classic Latin authors with the exception of a few formal expressions maintained through all periods, but more frequent in Sallust and Livy.² I have noted the following in Livy's speeches: 7, 30, 20 adnuite . . . numen; 9, 9, 13 sponsio . . . quam populi iussu spopondissemus; 9, 11, 7 pacem . . . pepigistis; 9, 11, 9; 31, 29, 16; 38, 48, 10; 38, 48, 11; 28, 40, 3 scio . . . rem actam hodierno die agi; 28, 43, 10 occidione occisi; 36, 17, 13 liberatam [Graeciam] liberare; 37, 54, 19 certare pio certamine.

To be considered also under paronomasia is alliteration, which differs from figura etymologica in that the former has to do

¹ Diomed. Gr. Lat., I, p. 446: "cum praecedenti nomini aut verbum aut nomen adnectitur ex eodem figuratu"; Rufin. RLM., 57, 30. A comprehensive study for Latin has been made by Landgraf (Acta Sem. Erlang., II, 1-69), who defines (p. 8): "est igitur figura etymologica compositio duorum congenerum vocabulorum, quae item grammaticae legibus arctissime inter se conexas unam eamque amplificatam atque disertissimam notionem efficiant".

² Wölfflin, A. L. L., VI, p. 448; Landgraf, op. cit., p. 4: Draeger, Synt. und Stil, etc., p. 22.

with a combination of words not generically related or grammatically dependent.¹ It is used with great frequency by Roman archaic writers,² and while many cases of intentional alliteration³ are found in the great prose writers, it cannot be called a striking stylistic feature of any except Nepos,⁴ Sallust,⁵ Cicero,⁶ and Tacitus.⁷ No study has as yet been made of usage in Livy's speeches, in which occurrences in the restricted sense⁸ are fairly frequent, e. g. 3, 67, 5 fusi fugatique; 3, 68, 13; 28, 43, 14; 28, 28, 9 fudi fugavi; 32, 21, 19; 38, 17, 15; 21, 44, 2 fidelissimos fortissimosque; 37, 54, 28 forti fidelique; 22, 6-

¹ Landgraf, *op. cit.*, p. 3: "cuius [alliterationis] natura haec est, ut duo vel plura deinceps vocabula quae tamen nullis grammaticae legibus inter se coniunguntur, ab iisdem litteris aut syllabis initium capiant". The term alliteration is used first by the Italian humanist Pontanus (1426-1503); see Norden, I, p. 59 note. However, the Romans were fully conscious that they used this rhetorical device; cf. Ad Her., IV, 12, 18 ("eiusdem litterae nimiam adsiduitatem"); Servius (on Aen., III, 183). Donat. (on Ter. Eun., 780) and Char. (Gr. Lat., I, p. 282) call the figure *παρόμοιον*. The Greek name is *ῥυμιοῦρκτον* according to a Scholium of Maximus. Planudes on Hermogenes (Rh. Gr. V 511, 6 Walz). The phenomenon in popular language and in religious and legal usage precedes any regular literature (see Tracy Peck, Alliteration in Latin, T.A.P.A., XV, pp. 58-65). Wölfflin (Zur Alliteration, Mélanges Boissier, Paris, 1903, p. 461 ff.) concludes that the Greeks did not recognize alliteration in the Latin sense.

² Wölfflin (Zur Alliteration, A.L.L., IX, p. 573); Peck (l. c.).

³ Frequency depends, of course, on the conception of the figure. Some regard it as the recurrence of the same or initial letter (or its phonetic equivalent) in two or more contiguous words, whatever their relation; see citations by Lahmeyer, *Die Allit. in Ciceros Pompeiana*, Progr., Görlitz, 1891, pp. 1-14, and definition p. 3. So in this wide sense examples by Petzke, pp. 75-77; Drenckhahn, *Lat. Stilistik*, Berlin, 1896, p. 84; Wichert, *Lat. Stillehre*, Königsberg, 1856, pp. 420, 430, 512. Such a principle makes no distinction between accidental and intentional alliteration, nor between the avoidable and practically unavoidable juxtaposition of alliterative words. In the sense used in Wölfflin's comprehensive and authoritative study (*Die allit. Verbind.*, München, 1881, p. 7) restriction is made to combinations of similar elements, or to members which are syntactically coordinate.

⁴ See Pretzsch, *Zur Stilistik des Corn. Nepos*, Progr., Spandau, 1890; Lupus, *op. cit.*, p. 199.

⁵ Gerstenberg, *Ueber die Reden bei Sallust*, Progr., Berlin, 1892, p. 16.

⁶ Especially in his earlier works; see Laurand, *Études sur le style des discours de Cicéron*, p. 113; Boissier (l. c.).

⁷ Gudeman, *Dialogus de Orat.*, Boston, 1894, p. xlviii; Petzke, p. 73.

⁸ See note 3 above.

20 fortia fidelia; 5, 51, 10 foedus ac fidem fefellerunt; 5, 52, 1 culpa cladisque; 7, 30, 20, nutum numenque; 7, 30, 23 lucem ac libertatem; 31, 29, 4 licentiam an levitatem; 39, 15, 1 ludum et lasciviam; 7, 35, 6 videntem ac vigilantem; 21, 41, 17 vis virtusque; 25, 38, 10; 22, 39, 19 vanam . . . veram; 41, 23, 17; 9, 34, 12 stolidos ac socordes; 10, 8, 12 faustum felixque; 21, 10, 11 furiam facemque; 21, 41, 10 indignatione atque ira; 22, 14, 8 oculos atque ora; 44, 38, 9 ore atque oculis; 22, 14, 14 audendo atque agendo; 22, 39, 20; 22, 39, 10 sede ac solo; 22, 39, 14 fame quam ferro; 22, 39, 22 clara certaue; 22, 39, 20 timidum pro cauto tardum pro considerato; 22, 59, 16 suspensi ac solliciti; 25, 38, 8 vivunt vigentque; 26, 13, 14 cruciatus contumeliasque; 26, 41, 12 integra atque immobilis; 26, 41, 18 auguriis auspiciisque; 27, 13, 5 pudere ac paenitere; 28, 27, 8 tacta tractataue; 28, 28, 10 amolior et amoveo; 28, 29, 7 satis superque; 30, 12, 16 oro obtestorque; 32, 21, 17 terrore ac tumultu; 34, 3, 5 destruet ac demolietur; 39, 16, 10 demolientes dissentientes; 34, 7, 9 gaudent et glorianur; 34, 7, 14 seditionem et secessionem; 36, 17, 12 provisum atque praecautum; 36, 7, 6 prius potiusque; 38, 49, 11 ceciderunt ceperunt; 39, 16, 5 flagitium et facinus; 39, 37, 7 corpus et concilium; 39, 37, 16 sancta atque sacrata; 40, 13, 7 certamine et concursu; 44, 22, 11 superbum . . . sapientem; 45, 23, 10 superbia stultitia; 44, 22, 12 prudentibus et peritis; 45, 39, 16 maledice ac maligne. In 38, 17, 5, insolita atque insueta, there is the emphasis of a double alliteration (prep. and stem). Effective also in their appeal to the ear are combinations whose members begin with the same preposition (neglected by Wölfflin), as 3, 68, 4 reddent ac restituent; 5, 5, 7 intermissiones . . . intervallaue; 25, 38, 15 obsessi . . . atque oppugnati; 26, 41, 7 transeamus transferamusque; 39, 16, 8 conquirerent comburerent; 40, 8, 7 conficti aut commissi; 37, 53, 27 decedere et deducere; 38, 48, 3 indixit aut intulit; 40, 10, 9 obligatam obnoxiam; 40, 11, 3 imbuti et infecti. Repetition of a negative compound is generally not an artistic device, as this method of expressing the lack of two qualities is natural, and, sometimes, unavoidable. The following seem to be used for emphasis: 9, 4, 12 inbellis atque inermis; 44, 38, 10 iners atque imbellis; 38, 47, 10 infamia atque invidia; 40, 11, 9 incertae . . . inanes.

Finally, of alliteration in the wider sense may be noted a few striking examples, in which, had no emphasis been felt, we

may assume changes in order and phraseology would have been made: 3, 67, 7 tribunos concupistis: concordiae causa concessimus. decemviros desiderastis, etc.; 3, 68, 1 ubi hic curiam circumsederitis et forum infestum feceritis et carcerem impleveritis principibus; 6, 18, 14 proinde adeste, prohibete ius . . . dici. ego me patronum profiteor plebis; 9, 9, 11 et illi male partam victoriam male perdiderunt; 9, 11, 8 hoc fide . . . foederibus . . . fetialibus caerimoniis dignum erat; 9, 11, 9 quod petisti per pactionem; 21, 40, 2 hunc hostem secutus confessionem cedentis ac detractantis certamen . . . habui; 28, 29, 1 revocavit tamen a publico parricidio privata pietas; 30, 31, 9 bellum parate, quoniam pacem pati non potuistis; 34, 2, 4 si coetus et concilia et secretas consultationes esse sinas; 34, 4, 13 pessimus quidem pudor est vel parsimoniae vel paupertatis; 39, 16, 1 si . . . a facinoribus manus, mentem a fraudibus abstinuissent; 40, 11, 2 clandestina concocta sunt consilia.

Livy uses paronomasia to make certain groups of words especially prominent and effective, and uses it more freely with speakers of circumspection and experience. Hence Q. Fabius in his speech of caution to Paulus uses eleven examples; Scipio, 21, 40-41, five, 28, 27-29, six, Manlius, five.

ASYNDETON.

This figure, a favorite with orators,¹ is aptly used to impart vivacity, energy, vehemence.² In Livy³ it occurs very fre-

¹ Aristotle (Rhet. III, 12, 2 f.) says it is well suited to practical eloquence (*λέξις ἀγωνιστική*), ill suited to written style (*λέξις γραφική*), because when unsupported by delivery the *ἀσύνδετα* fail in the proper effect, i. e. intonation must come into play to prevent their being felt as all one, of the same character and accent. Further, by their use many things appear to be said at the same time, on the principle that connecting particles unite several items into one, whereas by the omission of connections one becomes many. Hence *ἀσύνδετα* amplify, since the auditor seems to survey a number of items given. So Quint. (IX, 3, 50): "nam et singula inculcantur et quasi plura fiunt." Latin terms are: articulus (Ad Her., IV, 19, 26) of the omission of conjunctions between single words, dissolutum (IV, 30, 41) of the same between clauses; solutum (Aq. Rom. RLM., 35, 9; Capella, RLM., 482, 19); dissolutio (Quint., l. c.); dissolutio vel inconexio (Rufin. RLM., 53, 1).

² Quint. (l. c.); Tib. Rhet. Gr., III, 77, 27; Ad Her., IV, 30, 41: "Hoc genus [dissolutum] et acrimoniam habet in se et uehementis-

quently and in every variety. I have counted 546 examples in the speeches, excluding those involving anaphora, and limiting them to members of a single period.¹

The earliest form is the so-called asyndeton sollemne in stereotyped formulae.² Omitting 44 examples of the official combination, *patres conscripti*, and 6 of *optimus maximus*, both in use from the earliest period, Livy has few instances. Note 5, 5, 6 *novus de integro*; 22, 60, 20 *fortia fidelia*; 28, 39, 8 *ex insperato repente*; 39, 15, 11 *forte temere*; 44, 28, 8 *terra mari*; note also, in legal process, 9, 4, 16 *ite, consules, redimite*; 9, 11, 13 *i, lictor, deme*.

Asyndeton enumerativum is by far the largest class. Of individual words, nouns may be illustrated, by seven members in 26, 13, 13 *Roma, coniuges, liberi, arae, foci, delubra, sepulcra*; by six, 30, 14, 9 *ipse, coniunx, regnum, ager, oppida, homines*; by five, 5, 54, 4 *locum, colles, flumen, mare, locum*; 9, 9, 6; 38, 17, 3; by four, 3, 67, 9 *auxilium, provocationem, scita plebis, iura*; 22, 39, 11 *armis viris equis commeatibus*; 26, 13, 18; 28, 27, 4; 28, 43, 12; 34, 3, 7; 40, 10, 7; 41, 23, 10; 44, 22, 13; 44, 39, 1; by three, 3, 68, 5 *odia offensiones similitates*; 3, 68, 11; 4, 4, 3; 4, 4, 4; 5, 5, 11; 6, 41, 9; 7, 30, 19; 9, 9, 8; 22, 59, 15; 28, 42, 12; 28, 44, 5; 29, 17, 15; 29, 17, 18; 32, 21, 21; 34, 2, 11; 34, 7, 11; 38, 17, 7; 38, 17, 17; 38, 45, 10; 39, 16, 7; 39, 16, 8; 40, 13, 3; 40, 13, 4; 45, 23, 5; 45, 39, 5; by two, 3, 68, 4 *re fortuna*; 4, 3, 12; 4, 4, 2, etc. Proper names also are used effectively, as in 28, 28, 12 *Flaminio, Paulo, Graccho, Postumio Albino, M. Marcello, T. Quinctio Crispino, Cn. Fulvio, Scipioni-*

simum est et ad breuitatem adcommodatum." See also Longinus, *Περί Τύπου*, XX.

¹The most important collections are given by Kühnast, p. 284 ff., and Draeger, *Hist. Synt.*, II, pp. 190-212. See also Moczyński, pp. 22-23; M. Müller, *Sprachgebrauch des Livius*, Progr., Stendal, 1866, p. 3 ff.; Preuss, *De bimembris dissoluti apud scriptores. Rom. usu sollemni*, Edenkoben, 1881, passim.

²Following Nägelsbach (p. 656 note): "wir verstehen unter den Gliedern lediglich die der Struktur und grammatischen Geltung nach gleichartigen Satz- oder Periodenteile."

³Cf. Preuss, *op. cit.*, p. 7: "paulatim in vulgi consuetudinem ac proverbium eaque *δουδέρως* posita venerunt, ita ut procedente tempore prorsus vel certe plus minusve neglecta esse videatur coniunctio, quasi omnino non pertineat ad tales locutiones."

bus meis, tot tam praeclaris imperatoribus uno bello absumptis; 30, 30, 25 Sicilia, Sardinia, Hispania, quidquid insularum, etc. Notable is the case of Scipio, 26, 41, 10 f., recalling Roman victories following Roman defeats: vetera omitto, Porsinam, Gallos, Samnites . . . Trebia, Trasumennus, Cannae . . . adde defectionem Italiae, Siciliae maioris partis, Sardiniae. Three names are found: 3, 17, 3; 4, 3, 16; 31, 29, 10; 31, 29, 15; 37, 53, 24; 38, 17, 11; 38, 46, 4; 45, 24, 9; two names: 9, 8, 8; 26, 41, 15; 26, 41, 16; 28, 28, 6; 28, 28, 15; 28, 41, 13; 38, 17, 8; 40, 8, 15 (two pairs); 45, 22, 11; 45, 39, 2; 45, 39, 7. Adjectives in asyndeton are infrequent. Only the following were found: 22, 39, 12 meliores prudentiores constantiores; 40, 12, 6 circumventum solum inopem; 45, 39, 5 aurea marmorea eburnea; 9, 34, 18 antiquior . . . sancta; 22, 60, 30 quoted above; 37, 53, 21 extorris expulsus; 44, 38, 8 requietum, integrum; 5, 4, 5 tot tam; 26, 13, 17; 28, 28, 42. Verbs are not numerous but there are some striking examples, as in 29, 17, 15 omnes rapiunt, spoliant, verberant, vulnerant, occidunt, constuprant matronas, virgines, ingenuos raptos ex complexu parentum; 38, 48, 4 regna augetis donatis adimitis, curae vestrae censetis esse; 5, 5, 8 irati sunt, oderunt, negant misuros; 9, 8, 7 scribere armare educere; 28, 28, 9 fudi, fugavi, Hispania expuli; 38, 46, 6 caesi, fugati, exuti impedimentis sumus; 40, 11, 8 Romani laetabuntur, probabunt, defendent factum. Clauses and phrases in enumerative asyndeton, usually of two members, but extending to five (25, 6, 20; 9, 11, 4) and even to seven (5, 4, 13), are far too numerous for citation. However, a few instances will be given of asyndeton showing a quick succession of acts in a description¹ and intended to convey the idea of haste, speed, decision, etc., as 9, 1, 5 res hostium in praeda captas, . . . remisimus; auctores belli, . . . dedidimus; bona eorum, . . . Romam portavimus; 21, 41, 11 veniam dedimus precantibus, emisimus ex obsidione, pacem cum victis fecimus, tutelae deinde nostrae duximus; 28, 27, 15 in praetorio tetenderunt Albius et Atrius, classicum apud eos cecinit, signum ab iis petatum est, sederunt in tribunali P. Scipionis, lictor apparuit, summoto incesserunt, fascēs cum

¹ Called by Nägelsbach (p. 746) "Das ächte Asyndeton"; by Draeger (Hist. Synt., II, p. 209) "Das beschleunigende Asyndeton."

securibus praelati sunt; see also 28, 42, 3; 34, 6, 11 f.; 42, 13, 6 f.

Variety in enumerations is obtained where asyndeton is followed by coordinating particles: 3, 17, 5 consules tribunos deos hominesque; 6, 41, 9 tradamus ancilia penetralia deos deorumque curam; 7, 30, 23 salutem victoriam lucem ac libertatem; 26, 41, 14 secunda, prospera, in dies laetiora ac meliora; 28, 42, 11 moenia patriae, templa deum, aras et focus; 39, 15, 9 fanatici vigiliis, vino, strepitibus clamoribusque nocturnis attoniti. Occasionally the asyndeton is broken within the series by the connecting of two elements which are naturally associated, as in 23, 5, 6 legiones equitatus arma signa equi virique pecunia commeatus. The best example of asyndeton and particles used together is 21, 40, 9 effigies immo, umbrae hominum, fame frigore inlue squalore enecti, contusi ac debilitati inter saxa rupesque; ad hoc praeusti artus, nive rigentes nervi, membra torrida gelu, quassata fractaque arma, claudi ac debiles equi. Less frequently asyndeton is preceded by connectives, e. g. 28, 44, 15 terror fugaque, populatio agrorum, defectio sociorum, ceterae belli clades; 40, 8, 11 se stirpemque suam, domos, regna. For variety asyndeton and polysyndeton are occasionally united in the same sentence: 3, 67, 5 castris exuti, agro multati, sub iugum missi, et se et vos novere; 7, 13, 5 nobis deum benignitate, felicitate tua populique Romani et res et gloria est integra; 10, 7, 9 sellis curulibus, toga praetexta, tunica palmata et toga picta et corona triumphali laureaue.

Asyndeton adversativum¹ is found everywhere in the speeches, hence few illustrations will be given: 4, 5, 4 animos vestros illi temptabunt semper, vires non experientur; 9, 4, 14 quas [spes opesque] servando patriam servamus, dedendo ad necem patriam deserimus; 28, 27, 4 corpora, ora, vestitum, habitum civium adgnosco; facta, dicta, consilia, animos hostium video; 45, 39, 16 non enim de bello deliberatis, . . . , quod inferre potestis, gerere non potestis. Explanatory asyndeton (asynd. explicativum), in which the two members stand in a kind of apposition, is much less frequent. The second member may give not only an explanation or reason, but an infer-

¹ Draeger, *Hist. Synt.*, II, p. 202; *Synt. und Stil*, p. 56; Nägelsbach, p. 738; Kühnast, p. 287.

ence, or a logical conclusion. See 3, 68, 3 at enim communis res per haec loco est peiore: ager uritur, urbs obsidetur, belli gloria penes hostis est; 5, 51, 8; 5, 52, 8; 7, 30, 9; 7, 35, 4; 7, 40, 10; 9, 9, 10; 21, 43, 4; 22, 39, 9; 29, 18, 13; 29, 18, 16; 34, 2, 7; 34, 4, 8; 38, 17, 7; 38, 46, 11; 39, 15, 7; 40, 11, 9; 45, 23, 11; 45, 23, 14; 45, 24, 9; 4, 4, 8 nemo plebeius patriciae virgini vim adferret: patriciorum ista lubido est; 9, 34, 21; 21, 43, 11; 21, 44, 9; 22, 39, 9; 25, 6, 16; 26, 13, 14; 27, 13, 2; 28, 27, 8; 28, 42, 7; 29, 18, 10; 31, 29, 14; 34, 5, 12; 38, 17, 18; 39, 46, 1; 40, 10, 5; 40, 11, 8; 42, 42, 6; 42, 42, 9; 5, 4, 7 annua aera habes, annuam operam ede; 6, 18, 8 ego quidem nulli vestrum deero: ne fortuna mea desit, videte; 7, 40, 2; 9, 9, 18; 10, 8, 6; 22, 60, 20; 25, 6, 21; 26, 13, 16; 28, 29, 4; 28, 41, 9; 28, 42, 1; 28, 42, 17; 29, 18, 19; 32, 21, 29; 40, 9, 15; 40, 15, 8. Included here also are some forty instances of parenthesis, explanatory in purpose and frequently taking the place of a subordinate clause, e. g. in 4, 4, 1 nullane res nova institui debet, et, quod nondum est factum—multa enim nondum sunt facta in novo populo—ea, ne si utilia quidem sunt, fieri oportet? Asyndeton summativum,¹ which gives the result of a series, "in short," is well illustrated by 28, 42, 6 ubi non portus ullus classi nostrae apertus, non ager pacatus, non civitas socia, non rex amicus, non consistendi usquam locus, non procedendi; quacumque circumspexeris, hostilia omnia atque infesta; see also such examples as 6, 41, 10; 9, 34, 22; 26, 13, 13; 38, 17, 5; 45, 39, 3 et vos Gentium quam Persea duci in triumpho mavultis, Quirites, et de accessione potius belli quam de bello triumphari? et legiones ex Illyrico laureatae urbem inibunt et navales socii: Macedonicae legiones suo abrogato triumphos alienos spectabunt?

To summarize: asyndeton is to be found in practically every speech, but as indicative of rapid, forceful presentation, of vehemence which sets order aside, it is used relatively most

¹ Cf. Nägelsbach (p. 740); Kühnast, p. 284: "Das abschliessende As. (nicht glücklich summativum von Nägelsbach genannt)"; Draeger, *Hist. Synt.*, II, p. 206: "Das Asynd. summ. besteht theils aus einzelnen Wörtern, die eine Reihe von Begriffen zusammenfassen, gleichsam summiren, theils aus einem ganzen Satze, durch welchen das Ergebniss einer Gedankenreihe kurz angegeben wird." All Livy's examples noted are of clauses.

often by Cn. Manlius, Scipio, Q. Fabius, Capitolinus, and Astymedes.

POLYSYNDETON.

This figure is like asyndeton in that each is a *coacervatio*, but unlike it in that conjunctions are present.¹ It is employed freely in the speeches, and with but little variety, *et* being found most often, whether connecting words, or phrases, or clauses. Two members are usual, but occasionally more are found, as 37, 54, 11 *nam et Lycaonia et Phrygia utraque et Pisidia omnis et Chersonesus*; 21, 41, 2 *ubi et fratrem . . . socium haberem et Hasdrubalem . . . hostem et minorem haud dubie molem belli*; 22, 60, 26 *et castra et arma et vos ipsos traditis hosti*; 31, 29, 7; 34, 2, 11; 28, 44, 6; 29, 18, 1 *et nos queri . . . et vos audire et exsolvere rempublicam*; 29, 18, 18 *et nunc et tunc et saepe*; 30, 31, 6; 37, 54, 13; 38, 48, 11; 40, 14, 11. Variations with *-que*, *atque*, etc. occur as 5, 54, 3 *colles campique et Tiberis et adsueta oculis regio et hoc caelum*; 36, 7, 2 *cum de Euboea deque Achaeis et de Boeotia agebatur*; 36, 7, 4; 5, 51, 3 *diique et homines*; 5, 51, 10; 21, 41, 7; 21, 43, 9; 22, 14, 12; 25, 38, 7; 26, 13, 15; 29, 17, 12, 13, 20; 30, 12, 12; 36, 7, 16; 36, 17, 5; 37, 53, 12; 38, 45, 9; 41, 24, 2; 25, 6, 9 *et consuli primoribusque aliis*; 40, 9, 1 *et armati . . . accipiendi, praebendumque ferro iugulum*. Occasionally still other combinations: 5, 51, 8 *victi captique ac redempti*; 25, 6, 15 *illis arma tantum atque ordo militandi locusque*.

Polysyndeton is found in nearly all the speeches studied. Of the more extended speeches it is relatively most frequent in those by the Locrian embassy, Capitolinus, Hannibal (36, 7), L. Valerius, Cato, Cn. Manlius (38, 47-49), and Camillus. So little variety is observable in the usage as a whole that no conclusion can be drawn as to its prominence in the speeches here mentioned.

¹ Cf. Quint., IX, 3, 53 sq.: *Sed utrumque coacervatio et tantum iuncta aut dissoluta. . . Fons quidem unus, quia acriora facit et instantiora, quae dicimus, et vim quandam prae se ferentia velut saepius erumpentis affectus*. Volkmann, p. 474: "macht durch die ausgedrückte Häufung die Rede würdevoll und grossartig, und lässt auch wohl das kleine und unbedeutende grösser und bedeutsamer erscheinen, als es in Wirklichkeit ist." Latin writers ordinarily use the Greek term, but we find *multiugum* (Carmen de Fig., RLM., 65, 52).

By way of summary the following table is given to show Livy's varying usage in the rhetorical elements studied, passing from the earlier to the later parts of his work.

Decade.	Sententiae.	Interrogation.	Irony.	Climax.	Apostrophe and Exclamation.	Antithesis.	Hyperbole.	Anaphora.	Chiasmus.	Paronomasia.	Asyndeton.	Polysyndeton.	Total.	Average each Teubner page.
I. (35 pp.) ...	10	99	22	21	25	58	5	118	57	38	146	30	629	18
III. (43 pp.) ...	14	62	8	12	13	22	9	106	52	60	180	51	589	13 +
IV. (38 pp.) ...	17	60	6	5	10	17	1	81	37	47	122	68	471	12 +
V. (25 pp.) ...	3	72	7	1	5	3	0	71	20	20	98	30	330	13 +
Total	44	293	43	39	53	100	15	376	166	165	546	179	2019	14 +

A glance at the above table makes it clear that the occurrence of all figures is approximately one and one-half times as great in the first as it is in any one of the succeeding decades; also that with respect to seven of these figures, Irony, Climax, Apostrophe and Exclamation, Antithesis, Anaphora, Chiasmus, Asyndeton, each is more frequent in the first than in any of the later decades. In but three figures, Sententiae, Paronomasia, Polysyndeton, is the relative occurrence greater in the third or fourth than in the first decade, a reason for which in the case of the first two figures is advanced in the discussion given above. In Interrogation only is the relative frequency in the fifth equal to that of the first, while in Polysyndeton alone is it greater than that of the first.

From this variation it seems to be a reasonable conclusion that Livy's rhetorical dexterity was allowed freer scope in the first decade as a means of giving life, color, and emphasis to the remote and uncertain events with which he had to deal, resulting withal in a concitatus orationis genus well adapted to the impassioned orators whom Livy associates with Rome's early political and social struggles.

H. V. CANTER.

IV.—OATHS IN THE GREEK EPISTOLOGRAPHERS.

Though many¹ have investigated the oaths used in Greek comedy, dialogue, and oratory, the oaths used by the epistolographers seem never to have been studied in a comprehensive way.² In compiling the following list from Hercher's collection, an effort has been made to eliminate all curses, wishes, prayers, everything save genuine oaths, with the result that a considerable number of invocations, especially in the vocative, have been excluded.

OATHS BY THE GODS COLLECTIVELY (79).

μὰ τοὺς θεοὺς (22): Aen. 5; Aesch. 5. 1, 9. 2, 12. 16; Alciph. 2. 4. 17; Aristaen. 1. 28; Demos. 5. 3; Jul. 9. 6, 58. 6, 58. 15; Phalar. 31, 68, 95. 2, 119. 1, 124, 128, 131, 133, 137; Procop. 102, 116, 140. μὰ τοὺς θεοὺς τοὺς σωτῆρας: Jul. 58. 24. μὰ τὸν Δία καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους θεοὺς: Aesch. 11. 6. νῆ θεοὺς: Aristaen. 1. 4. νῆ τοὺς θεοὺς (14): Alciph. 2. 3. 3 (Menander); Aristaen. 1. 28; Hippoc. 17. 2; Jul. 6, 22. 2, 50. 2, 58. 19, 58. 21, 68. 1; Phalar. 125, 132; Plato 7. 349; Procop. 30; Synes. 104. 244 c. πρὸς θεῶν (15): Aristaen. 1. 5, 1. 6, 1. 22, 2. 1, 2. 4, 2. 7, 2. 15; Diog. 36. 4; Hippoc. 17. 23; Phalar. 142. 2; Procop. 101; Theophyl. 8, 12, 21, 23. πρὸς τῶν θεῶν (2): Alciph. 2. 2. 8; Jul. 58. 4. πρὸς θεῶν καὶ δαιμόνων: Alciph. 3. 39. 1. πρὸς Διὸς τε ἱκεσίου καὶ θεῶν ὁμογνίων: Hippoc. 26. πρὸς Διὸς ξενίου καὶ πάντων τῶν θεῶν: Demos. 5. 1. ὦ θεοί (8): Aesch. 12. 3; Alciph. 3. 50. 3, 3. 61. 3, 3. 72. 1; Jul. 26. 2; Phalar. 141. 2, 141. 3; Philostrat. 73. 3 (Gorgias 12). ὦ θεοὶ καὶ δαίμονες οἱ τῆς ἀληθείας τῆς ἐν

¹ Cf. the author's Princeton diss. (1910), *Studies in Menander*, Chapter I, Oaths in Menander, with the bibliography there cited. The most important collections of material are to be found in: Kühnlein, *De vi et usu precandi et iurandi formularum apud decem oratores Atticos*, progr. v. Neustadt a. d. H. (1882); Meinhardt, *De forma et usu iuramentorum, quae inveniuntur in comic. Gr. et Platonis, Xenophontis, Luciani sermone*, diss. Jena (1892); Ziebarth, *De iureiurando in iure Graeco quaestiones*, diss. Göttingen (1892).

² The epistolary oaths ascribed to the ten orators are incorporated in Kühnlein's collection, and those to Plato and Lucian in Meinhardt's.

ἀνθρώποις ἱστορες: Themist. 8. ὦ γῆ καὶ θεοί: Aristaen. 2. 20.
 θεοὶ ἐπιμάρτυρες ἔστων: Procop. 93. ὄμνυμι τοὺς θεούς: Pythag.
 9. ὄμνυμι τοὺς θεοὺς αὐτοὺς καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ σοὶ με ἀνάψαντα πόθον: Jul.
 59. 3. ὡς ἴσασιν οἱ θεοί (2): Jul. 4, 37. 2. ὡς ἴσασιν οἱ θεοὶ πάντες
 (2): Jul. 58. 10, 62. 7. ἴστω Ζεὺς, ἴστω μέγας Ἥλιος, ἴστω Ἀθηνᾶς
 κράτος καὶ πάντες θεοὶ καὶ πᾶσαι: Jul. 37. 4. ὄμνυμι τίνα θεῶν;
 Aristaen. 2. 2. κατόμνυσθε τοὺς θεούς: Aristaen. 2. 20.

OATH BY THE TWELVE GODS.

μὰ τοὺς δώδεκα θεούς: Alciph. 2. 3. 8 (Menander).

OATHS BY ATHENA (3).

νῆ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν (2): Alciph. 2. 3. 6 (Menander); Solon 4.
 ἴστω Ζεὺς, ἴστω μέγας Ἥλιος, ἴστω Ἀθηνᾶς κράτος καὶ πάντες θεοὶ καὶ
 πᾶσαι: Jul. 37. 4.

OATHS BY APOLLO (3).¹

νῆ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα: Aristaen. 1. 4. Ἀπολλὸν ἀποτρόπαιε: Aris-
 taen. 2. 1. μὰ τὸν Ἀρισταῖον καὶ τὸν Ἀπόλλω αὐτόν: Aelian 5.

OATH BY ARISTAEUS.

μὰ τὸν Ἀρισταῖον καὶ τὸν Ἀπόλλω αὐτόν: Aelian 5.

OATHS BY ARTEMIS (9).

μὰ τὴν Ἀρτεμιν (4): Alciph. 2. 1. 5, 2. 2. 6, 2. 4. 20; Aristaen.
 1. 10. νῆ τὴν Ἀρτεμιν (5): Alciph. 2. 1. 8, 2. 4. 5, fr. 5. 4; Aristaen.
 1. 6, 1. 11.

OATHS BY APHRODITE (17).

μὰ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην: Alciph. 2. 2. 2. νῆ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην (6):
 Alciph. 1. 39. 4, 2. 1. 1, 2. 1. 3, fr. 4. 1, fr. 5. 2; Aristaen. 1. 8.
 πρὸς τῆς Ἀφροδίτης (3): Alciph. 2. 2. 6; Aristaen. 1. 24, 1. 27.
 πρὸς τῶν Χαρίτων καὶ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης: Jul. 58. 3. δέσποινα Ἀφρο-
 δίτη (3): Alciph. 1. 32. 1, 1. 36. 3, 1. 39. 1. μαρτύρομαι τὴν
 Ἀφροδίτην: Aristaen. 1. 25. οὕτως ἔλεως εἴη μοι Ἀφροδίτη: Aris-
 taen. 2. 13. νῆ τὴν μεγάλην θεόν: Alciph. 1. 39. 2.

OATH BY GÊ.

ὦ γῆ καὶ θεοί: Aristaen. 2. 20.

¹ In his review of Professor Wright's *Studies in Menander*, Boll. di fil. cl., XVIII (1912) 195, Terzaghi says that slaves swore by Apollo. There is a special propriety in this as Apollo himself was a slave to Admetus (A. J. P. XXXII 364).—B. L. G.

OATH BY DEMETER.

μὰ τὴν καλλιγένειαν: Alciph. 2. 4. 1.

OATHS BY THE TWO GODDESSES (5).

μὰ τὰς θεάς: Alciph. 2. 4. 3. μὰ τὰς Ἑλευσινίας θεάς, μὰ τὰ μυστήρια αὐτῶν: Alciph. 2. 3. 1 (Menander). νῆ τὸ θεῶ (2): Aristaen. 1. 19, 1. 27. νῆ τὰ μυστήρια: Alciph. 2. 2. 8.

OATHS BY JUSTICE (2).

νῆ τὴν Δίκην: Aristaen. 1. 20. νῆ τὴν θείαν δίκην: Jul. 54. 3.

OATHS BY DIONYSUS (2).

μὰ τὸν Διόνυσον καὶ τοὺς βακχικοὺς αὐτοῦ κισσοῦς: Alciph. 2. 3. 10 (Menander). ὦ φίλε Διόνυσε: Aristaen. 1. 18.

OATH BY DIONE.

νῆ τὴν Διώνην: Aristaen. 1. 19.

OATHS BY EROS (10).

μὰ τοὺς Ἔρωτας: Aristaen. 2. 16. νῆ τὸν Ἔρωτα τὸν εὐτυχῶς εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν τετοξευκότα ψυχὴν: Aristaen. 2. 21. νῆ τοὺς Ἔρωτας (4): Aristaen. 1. 7, 1. 22, 1. 27, 2. 13. πρὸς τοῦ Ἔρωτος: Aristaen. 2. 5. πρὸς Ἔρωτος: Philostrat. 13. πρὸς Ἔρωτος αὐτοῦ καὶ φιλίας ἐκείνης: Procop. 53. ὦ φίλοι Ἔρωτες: Procop. 15.

OATHS BY HERMES (2).

πρὸς Ἑρμοῦ καὶ Μουσῶν: Jul. 2. 1. Ἑρμῇ κερδῶε καὶ ἀλεξίκακε Ἡράκλει: Alciph. 3. 47. 1.

OATH BY HESTIA.

νῆ τὴν ἱερὰν Ἑστίαν: Synes. 148. 284 c.

OATHS BY ZEUS (81).

μὰ Δία (19): Aesch. 12. 1; Alciph. fr. 6. 17; Aristaen. 1. 10, 2. 21; Brutus 56; Chio 3. 4; Diog. 29. 1 (twice); Hippoc. 20. 3; Jul. 22. 1, 50. 3, 61. 3; Phalar. 141. 2, 145; Procop. 48, 74, 146; Themist. 4. 1, 8. μὰ τὸν Δία (3): Aesch. 12. 9; Phalar. 136. 1, 144. 4. μὰ τὸν Δία καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους θεοὺς: Aesch. 11. 6. καὶ μὰ Δία (2): Aristaen. 2. 12; Jul. 3. 1. νῆ Δία (15): Aelian 18; Alciph. 1. 39. 5, 1. 39. 7, fr. 6. 7; Brutus 40; Chio 16. 3; Demos. 4. 8; Hippoc. 17. 17; Jul. 59. 4; Luc. 3. 32; Phalar.

22, 141. 2, 143. 1; Socrat. 7. 2; Synes. 136. 272 b. νῆ τὸν Δία: Aristaen. 1. 13. νῆ τὸν Δία τὸν μέγιστον (2): Phalar. 77. 2, 113. νῆ τὸν Δία τὸν Ὀλύμπιον: Socrat. 27. 1. πρὸς Διὸς (9): Aesch. 2. 5; Alciph. 3. 5. 1; Aristaen. 1. 13, 2. 9, 2. 19; Phalar. 140. 2, 158; Procop. 58, 125. πρὸς τοῦ Διὸς: Jul. 58. 14. ὦ Ζεῦ (5): Jul. 52. 1; Procop. 9, 116, 161, 163. ὦ Ζεῦ βασιλεῦ: Hippoc. 17. 16. μὰ τὸν θεόν: Jul. 16. 6. μὰ τὸν Φίλιον τὸν ἐμόν τε καὶ σόν (2): Aristaen. 2. 14, Synes. 103. 241 c. ναὶ μὰ τὸν Φίλιον κτλ. (2): Synes. 49. 187 d, 59. 203 d. νῆ τὸν Φίλιον κτλ.: Synes. 129. 263 c. πρὸς φιλίου Διὸς: Aen. 1. πρὸς Διὸς φιλίου: Jul. 3. 2. πρὸς Διὸς φιλίου τε καὶ ἐταιρείου, καὶ τοῦ εἶτε κατὰ γῆν ἐν εὐσεβῶν χώρῳ ὄντος εἶτε κατ' ἄστρο Σωκράτους: Socrat. 27. 1. πρὸς Φιλίου (4): Procop. 75, 103, 116, 132. πρὸς ἐταιρείου Διὸς καὶ κοινῆς ἐστίας: Phalar. 79. πρὸς Διὸς τε ἱκεσίου καὶ θεῶν ὁμογνίων: Hippoc. 26. πρὸς Διὸς ξενίου καὶ πάντων τῶν θεῶν: Demos. 5. 1. ἴστω Ζεὺς: Jul. 22. 2. ἴστω Ζεὺς, ἴστω μέγας Ἥλιος, ἴστω Ἀθηνᾶς κράτος καὶ πάντες θεοὶ καὶ πᾶσαι: Jul. 37. 4. ἴττω Ζεὺς: Plato. 7. 345. μάρτυς ὁ Ἥλιος . . . καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ζεὺς: Jul. 12. 1. ὁμνυμι τὸν πάντων ἀγαθῶν ἐμοὶ αἷτιον καὶ σωτῆρα: Jul. 71. 2.

OATHS BY HELIOS (3).

νῆ τὸν Ἥλιον: Phalar. 142. 3. ἴστω Ζεὺς, ἴστω μέγας Ἥλιος, ἴστω Ἀθηνᾶς κράτος καὶ πάντες θεοὶ καὶ πᾶσαι: Jul. 37. 4. μάρτυς ὁ Ἥλιος καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ζεὺς: Jul. 12. 1.

OATH BY HERA.

νῆ τὴν Ἥραν: Aristaen. 1. 19.

OATHS BY HERACLES (7).

μὰ τὸν Ἡρακλέα: Phalar. 64. νῆ τὸν Ἡρακλέα: Crates 8. Ἡράκλεις (4): Alciph. 3. 61. 1; Hippoc. 17. 20; Luc. 3. 32; Procop. 54. Ἑρμῇ κερδῶε καὶ ἀλεξίκακε Ἡράκλεις: Alciph. 3. 47. 1.

OATH BY THEMIS.

νῆ τὴν Θέμιν: Proclus, Typi Epistolares 40.

OATHS BY THE FATES.

ὦ φίλαι Μοῖραι: Alciph. 1. 38. 5.

OATHS BY THE MUSES (4).

μὰ τὰς φίλας Μούσας: Alciph. 2. 1. 7. νῆ τὰς Μούσας (2): Aristaen. 2. 5, 2. 19. πρὸς Ἑρμοῦ καὶ Μουσῶν: Jul. 2. 1.

OATH BY NEMESIS.

Νέμεσι δέσποινα: Alciph. fr. 4. 3.

OATHS BY THE NYMPHS (2).

πρὸς τῶν Νυμφῶν καὶ τοῦ Πανὸς τούτου: Alciph. fr. 6. 6. νῆ τὰς
κωλιάδας Νύμφας: Aristaen. I. 3.

OATHS BY PAN (2).

πρὸς τοῦ Πανός: Aelian I. πρὸς τῶν Νυμφῶν καὶ τοῦ Πανὸς
τούτου: Alciph. fr. 6. 6.

OATH BY POSEIDON.

πρὸς τοῦ σοῦ Ποσειδῶνος: Aristaen. I. 7.

OATHS BY SERAPIS (2).

ὄμνυμι τὸν μέγαν Σάραπιν: Jul. 5. 2. πρὸς τοῦ Σαράπιδος: Jul.
9. 3.

OATHS BY THE GRACES (6).

νῆ τὰς Χάριτας (4): Aristaen. I. 3, I. 14, I. 19; Procop. 135.
πρὸς τῶν Χαρίτων: Aristaen. I. 11. πρὸς τῶν Χαρίτων καὶ τῆς
Ἀφροδίτης: Jul. 58. 3.

OATH BY THE SEASONS.

νῆ τὰς φίλας Ὠρας: Aristaen. I. 11.

OATHS BY THE DEMONS (2).

πρὸς θεῶν καὶ δαιμόνων: Alciph. 3. 39. I. ὧ θεοὶ καὶ δαίμονες οἱ
τῆς ἀληθείας τῆς ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἱστορες: Themist. 8.

OATHS BY GOD (8).

ταῦτα θεόν, ταῦτα ἀνθρώπους μαρτύρομαι: Synes. 105. 249 d.
μαρτύρομαι τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεόν: Synes. 57. 194 d. μάρτυς θεός (2):
Synes. 146. 282 d, 146. 283 a. νῆ τὸν ἔφορον ἀληθείας θεόν: Synes.
105. 250 c. ὄμνυμι θεὸν ὃν φιλοσοφία πρεσβεύει: Synes. 4. 162 c.
μάρτυρα ποιῶμαι θεὸν ὃν φιλοσοφία πρεσβεύει: Synes. 123. 259 d.
μάρτυρα ποιῶμαι θεὸν ὃν καὶ φιλοσοφία καὶ φιλία πρεσβεύει: Synes.
96. 236 a.

OATHS BY HUMAN ATTRIBUTES (32).

ταῦτα θεόν, ταῦτα ἀνθρώπους μαρτύρομαι: Synes. 105. 249 d. νῆ
τὴν τούτων τῶν κακῶν ἀπαλλαγὴν: Alciph. 2. 2. 8. πρὸς τούτων τῶν
γενεῶν: Philostrat. 13. νῆ τὴν τιμίαν σου διάθεσιν: Synes. 129.

263 d. ὅμοσα κατ' ἐξωλείας ἑμαντοῦ: Alciph. 3. 3. 4. πρὸς ἐταιρείου Διὸς καὶ κοινῆς ἐστίας: Phalar. 79. πρὸς τῆς σῆς εὐμουσίας: Aristaen. 1. 2. πρὸς τοῦ σοῦ κάλλους: Aristaen. 1. 4. νῆ τὴν ἱεράν σου κεφαλὴν (2): Synes. 95. 233 c, 105. 250 c. νῆ τὴν ἱεράν σου κεφαλὴν καὶ τὴν τῶν παιδίων μου σωτηρίαν: Synes. 95. 234 c. νῆ τὴν ἱεράν σου καὶ τριπόθητον κεφαλὴν: Synes. 79. 224 c. νῆ τὴν ἱεράν ὑμῶν κεφαλὴν: Synes. 79. 226 d. μὰ τὴν τιμίαν σου κεφαλὴν: Synes. 134. 271 b. ναὶ μὰ τὴν φίλην σου καὶ σεβασμίαν κεφαλὴν: Synes. 67. 214 d. πρὸς τῶν λόγων: Synes. 73. 220 d. ναὶ μὰ τοὺς λόγους: Synes. 91. 231 c. ὁμνυμι οὐ τὴν πλάτανον τὴν Σωκράτους ἀλλὰ τοὺς λόγους αὐτούς: Procop. 63. πρὸς τῶν Θεαίδος μαστῶν καὶ φιλημάτων: Aristaen. 2. 16. μὰ τὸν σὸν Νεῖλον καὶ τὰς παρούσας σοὶ Χάριτας: Procop. 116. μὰ τὸν ὁμόγειον τὸν ἐμόν τε καὶ σόν: Synes. 95. 233 c. ναὶ μὰ τοὺς ἀψευδεῖς Παρρασίου πίνακας: Theophyl. 6. νῆ τὸ σὸν πρόσωπον: Aristaen. 2. 9. ὁμνυμι τὰς Χάριτας Πυθιάδος: Aristaen. 1. 12. πρὸς Διὸς φίλιον τε καὶ ἐταιρείον, καὶ τοῦ εἴτε κατὰ γῆν ἐν εὐσεβῶν χώρῳ ὄντος εἴτε κατ' ἄστρα Σωκράτους: Socrat. 27. 1. μὰ τὴν σὴν φαρέτραν: Aristaen. 2. 13. πρὸς Ἐρωτος αὐτοῦ καὶ φιλίας ἐκείνης: Procop. 53. πρὸς σαντοῦ καὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς φιλίας ἡμῶν: Diony. Antioch. 16. μὰ ἐμὸν φρένα καιομέναν πόθῳ: Jul. 59. 1. ὁμνύω τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ σοί με ἀνάπαντα πόθον: Jul. 59. 3. ναὶ πρὸς ἐμῆς καὶ τῶν αὐταδέλφων τῶν ἐμῶν σωτηρίας: Alciph. 3. 39. 3. πρὸς αὐτῆς τῆς ψυχῆς: Synes. 141. 278 a.

Apart from the oaths "by human attributes", the Christian oaths of Synesius "by God", and the Egyptian oath "by Serapis", the preceding list of 33 different types of oaths includes all the oaths used in Greek comedy, except those by Asclepius and Hephaestus (which are not found in Aristophanes, either), together with the following additional oaths, suggestive of post-classic and Alexandrian influence: By Aristaeus, Justice, Dione, Eros, Hera (an oath used especially by Socrates), Themis, Fates, Muses, Nemesis, Nymphs, Pan, Graces, and Seasons.

The 293 oaths are distributed among 25 of the 60 authors in Hercher's volume as follows:

Aelian (4): Apollo (1), Aristaeus (1), Zeus (1), Pan (1)
 4 types.

Aeneas (2): Gods collectively (1), Zeus (1) . . . 2 types.

Aeschines (9): Gods collectively (5), Zeus (4) . . . 6 types.

Alciphron (48): Gods collectively (7), Twelve Gods (1), Athena (1), Artemis (6), Aphrodite (11), Demeter (1), Two Goddesses (3), Dionysus (1), Hermes (1), Zeus (5), Heracles (2), Fates (1), Muses (1), Nemesis (1), Nymphs (1), Pan (1), Demons (1), Human attributes (3) 33 types.

Aristaenetos (60): Gods collectively (13), Apollo (2), Artemis (3), Aphrodite (5), Gê (1), Two Goddesses (2), Justice (1), Dionysus (1), Dione (1), Eros (7), Zeus (8), Hera (1), Muses (2), Nymphs (1), Poseidon (1), Graces (4), Seasons (1), Human attributes (6) 41 types.

Brutus (2): Zeus (2) 2 types.

Chio (2): Zeus (2) 2 types.

Crates (1): Heracles (1) 1 type.

Demosthenes (4): Gods collectively (2), Zeus (2) 3 types.

Diogenes (3): Gods collectively (1); Zeus (2) 2 types.

Dionysius of Antioch (1): Human attributes (1) 1 type.

Hippocrates (8): Gods collectively (3), Zeus (4), Heracles (1) 7 types.

Julian (43): Gods collectively (18), Athena (1), Aphrodite (1), Justice (1), Hêrmes (1), Zeus (13), Helios (2), Muses (1), Serapis (2), Graces (1), Human attributes (2) 25 types.

Lucian (2): Zeus (1), Heracles (1) 2 types.

Phalaris (29): Gods collectively (14), Zeus (12), Helios (1), Heracles (1), Human attributes (1) 12 types.

Philostratus (3): Gods collectively (1), Eros (1), Human attributes (1) 3 types.

Plato (2): Gods collectively (1), Zeus (1) 2 types.

Procopius (26): Gods collectively (6), Eros (2), Zeus (13), Heracles (1), Graces (1), Human attributes (3) 15 types.

Pythagoreans (1): Gods collectively (1) 1 type.

Socratics (4): Zeus (3), Human attributes (1) 3 types.

Solon (1): Athena (1) . . . 1 type.

Synesius (28): Gods collectively (1), Hestia (1), Zeus (5), God (8), Human attributes (13) 18 types.

Themistocles (4): Gods collectively (1), Zeus (2), Demons (1) 2 types.

Theophylactus (5): Gods collectively (4). Human attributes (1) 2 types.

Proclus, Typi Epistolares (1): Themis (1) 1 type.

Note especially that three authors, Aristaenetus, Alciphron, and Julian, contain 151 of the total of 293 oaths; and that three others, Phalaris, Synesius, and Procopius, contain 83 more, leaving the remaining 59 oaths to be divided among the other nineteen authors. The first group is further distinguished by the great variety of oaths; while with Synesius, the Christian writer, one is struck with the presence of non-Christian oaths.

The formulae largely conform to what we know to have been normal. *νῆ θεούς*, Aristaen. 1. 4, seems unique, elsewhere in Greek literature always *νῆ τοὺς θεούς*.¹ The epistolographers prefer *πρὸς θεῶν* (15) to *πρὸς τῶν θεῶν* (2), as do Plato and Menander and the Middle Comedy, in striking contrast with Aristophanes a further confirmation of the assumed popular decreasing use of the article.² In the oaths by Zeus, with *μά, νή, πρὸς* and without a modifying epithet, the shorter forms predominate 45 to five. This also is in keeping with the usage of Plato, Lucian,³ the Middle Comedy,⁴ and Menander.⁵ There are three violations of the general rule, proved for Aristophanes, Menander, and the orators, that oaths introduced by *πρὸς* are confined to imperative and interrogative sentences⁶: Aristaen. 1. 24 (corrupt), 1. 27; Jul. 59. 14.

There are many oaths cast in unusual, literary, non-idiomatic forms, but not more than might be expected in such artificial writers. The artificiality of some of these oaths is evidently recognized by the user. Thus, Procop. 93, *νυνὶ δὲ μμήσομαι γοῦν τι ποητικὸν καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον ὁμοῦμαι, θεοὶ δ' ἐπιμάρτυρες ἔστων*; or Plato 7. 345, *ἴτω Ζεὺς φησιν ὁ Θηβαῖος*. Artificiality is a notable characteristic of most of the oaths under the heading, "Oaths by human attributes". This is

¹ Cf. Studies in Menander, 36, 71.

² Ibid., 9.

³ Cf. Meinhardt, 18 f.

⁴ Cf. Selvers, *De mediae comoediae sermone*, diss. Westphalia (1909), 61.

⁵ Cf. Studies in Menander, 35. This applies to *μά, νή, πρὸς (τοῦ) Διός* does not occur in the extant Menander.

⁶ Ibid., 9.

balanced in most cases by peculiar appropriateness to the situation under which they are uttered or to the person to whom they are addressed. Such appropriateness appears elsewhere also, for, Alciph. 2. 4. 1, Glycera swears to Menander by Calligenia in whose temple she is. In Alciph. fr. 6. 6, one of the merry women swears by the Nymphs and the Graces whose statues stand near by. "By thy Poseidon", is the oath addressed, Aristaen. 1. 7, to a fisherman, and, id. 2. 21, the love-sick Abrocomas swears by Cupid who has shot so straight into his heart.

The established principles of sex appropriateness, also, are well observed: Women do not swear by Athena,¹ Apollo,² or Heracles.³ Men do not swear by Artemis.⁴ The oath by Poseidon⁵ is used by the maiden in the passage just mentioned, for the fisherman's sake. Aristaen. 1. 18, a woman invokes Dionysus,⁶ but she is one who knows and praises the charms of wine. Alciph. 2. 31 ascribes to Menander the oath by the two Goddesses,⁷ but it is to be noticed that it is not in the usual feminine form, and that it is addressed to a woman and is coupled with the oath by the mysteries, which were especially sacred in the eyes of every Athenian. Such exceptions rather attest than disprove the rules.

What bearing may this study have upon the vexed problem of the authenticity of the letters in Hercher's volume? As is well-known, a very considerable proportion of them were written, not by the philosophers, orators, or statesmen to whom they are ascribed, but by sophistic falsifiers of the Imperial Roman or Byzantine period. The ascription in whole or in part has been doubted by one or more scholars in the case of fourteen of the 25 "authors" of our list. These fourteen are⁸ Aeschines, Brutus, Chio, Crates, Demosthenes, Diogenes, Hippocrates, Julian, Phalaris, Philostratus, Plato, Pythagoras, Socrates, and Solon. From the investigations of Kühnlein and Meinhardt, we know the oaths used in the undisputed works of Aeschines, Demosthenes, and Plato, three of the fourteen. Do the same oaths occur in the letters ascribed to them? Those used in the "letters of Aeschines", *μὰ τοὺς*

¹ Ibid., 15.² Ibid., 18.³ Ibid., 45.⁴ Meinhardt, 57.⁵ Studies in Menander, 48.⁶ Ibid., 29 f.⁷ Ibid., 28.⁸ Cf. Christ, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur*⁵, s. v.

θεούς (3), ὦ θεοί (1), πρὸς Διός (1), μὰ τὸν Δία καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους θεούς (1), μὰ τὸν Δία (1), and μὰ Δία (1), are all common types of oaths and might well have been used in his orations. But it so happens that while the orator uses oaths that are similar in form, μὰ Δία, occurring twice, is the only one of these that he actually does use. Of those in the letters ascribed to Demosthenes, μὰ τοὺς θεούς (1) occurs twenty times in the orations, and νῆ Δία (1), 99 times; but πρὸς Διὸς ξενίου καὶ πάντων τῶν θεῶν (1) is to be found neither in the undisputed Demosthenes nor apparently elsewhere in classical Greek literature. The two oaths in the "Platonic" letters both occur in his surely authentic works: νῆ τοὺς θεούς (1), eleven times, and ἴττω Ζεύς (1) in *Phaedo* 62 a, where, as in the letter, it is recognized as a peculiarly Theban oath: Cebes, the Theban, τῇ αὐτοῦ φωνῇ εἰπών. This might be conscious imitation, or mere coincidence. It certainly furnishes no conclusive evidence. Apparently oaths were not one of the characteristics of the style of their models which the epistolographers made any general effort to imitate. At least it is hazardous to use them as a test of the authenticity of the letters.

F. WARREN WRIGHT.

SMITH COLLEGE.

V.—CHAUCER'S GRISELDA AND HOMER'S ARETE.

Griselda's virtues and charms, manifest to all the world after her marriage to Walter, are extolled by Chaucer at some length. She seemed born of noble lineage (Clerk's Tale 393-9), rather than of Janicula (400-6); every one loved her (407-413); not only in Saluzzo, but throughout the country, did her fame extend (414-420), so that the people admired Walter's prudence in making such a choice (421-7).

So far Chaucer follows Petrarch, who in turn follows Boccaccio, the latter adding that Walter considered himself the happiest man alive. But then Chaucer goes on to a new article of praise (428-441):

Nat only this Grisildis thurgh hir wit
Coude al the feet of wyfly hoomlinesse,
But eek, whan that the cas requyred it,
The commune profit coude she redresse.
Ther nas discord, rancour, ne hevinesse
In al that lond, that she ne coude apese,
And wysly bringe hem alle in reste and ese.

Though that hir housbonde absent were anoon,
If gentil men, or othere of hir contree,
Were wrothe, she wolde bringen hem atoon;
So wyse and rype wordes hadde she,
And jugements of so greet equitee,
That she from heven sent was, as men wende,
Peple to save, and every wrong tamende.

Here, again, Chaucer is following Petrarch, whose account ¹ may be thus rendered:

Nor was she skilful merely in the occupations of a housewife, but, whenever occasion demanded, she acted in a public capacity in the absence of her husband, putting an end to civil strife, and allaying the dissensions of the nobility; her well-considered

¹ Neque vero sollers sponsa muliebria tantum ac (Opera, 1581, *haec*) domestica, sed, ubi res posceret, publica etiam obibat officia viro absente (ed. 1472: *viro etiam abeunte*; ed. Veesenmeyer, Fiske Library of Cornell University: *publica officia etiam obibat viro abeunte*), lites

utterances being conceived with such ripeness and fairness of judgment that every one declared her to have been sent down from heaven for the salvation of the commonwealth.

This passage is manifestly important for the characterization of Griselda, since it shows that she was neither a timid serf, cowering in the presence of a superior order, nor a fanatic incapable of sober sense, nor yet a creature whose will had been enfeebled by overmuch meditation upon an ideal of saintly passivity. Rather does it impart to her a solidity and relief without which she might seem relatively bloodless and attenuated. By this touch she takes on a certain likeness to Antigone and Penelope, women of principle and decision—not masculine, but fit consorts for men of power and rank, suited to be mothers of a noble breed.

The Hellenic ideal of womanly competence and equality to every occasion is well illustrated by Arete, queen of the Phæacians. Though she is swiftly and silently obedient to her husband's requests (8. 423-444), it is by her wisdom that he is ruled. Nausicaa tells Odysseus that, when he has found the palace of Alcinous, he is to enter and find Arete at her spinning, and Alcinous at his wine. Then (Od. 6. 310-5, tr. Cotterill):

Him pass hastily by, but my mother approach, and entreat her,
Clasping her knees with thy hands; and the joyous day of returning
Soon shalt thou see—yea, though far distant lieth thy country.
Shouldst thou be able to gain of my mother her heart and her favor,
Then good hope will be thine to revisit thy friends, and in safety
Win to thy well-built home once more, and the land of thy fathers.

Almost identical is the counsel of Pallas Athene, in the form of a Phæacian maiden (Od. 7. 75-7):

Shouldst thou be able to gain of the lady her heart and her favor,
Then good hope will be thine to revisit thy friends, and in safety
Win to thy high-roofed home once more, and the land of thy fathers.

Odysseus obeys, and to Arete he thus appeals (Od. 7. 151-2):

Nay, but vouchsafe me an escort, and aid my return to my homeland
Soon, for afar from my friends long years have I suffered affliction.

*patriæ nobiliumque discordias dirimens atque componens tam gravibus
responsis tantaque maturitate et iudicii æquitate ut omnes ad salutem
publicam demissam cœlo feminam prædicarent.*

Arete makes no immediate answer, but later addresses him (Od. 7. 233-9):

White-armed Arete then began, and breaking the silence
 Spake, for she wondering saw and remembered the mantle and doublet,
 Beautiful garments whereat she had worked, both she and her maidens.
 Opening therefore her lips, these swift-winged words she addressed him:
 'First, O stranger, I ask—yea, even myself will demand it—
 Who art thou? Whence art thou come? Who gave thee the raiment
 thou wearest?
 Didst thou not say that thou camest a wanderer over the ocean?'

To which Odysseus then replies at some length (Od. 7. 241-297).

The next day, after Odysseus had paused in his tale, Arete addresses her subjects, and proposes that they shall bestow gifts upon the stranger (Od. 11. 336-341), her suggestion being cordially seconded by Alcinous.

It is Athene who, speaking of Alcinous and Arete, describes her in this memorable passage (Od. 7. 67-74), of which the italicized part bears a likeness, it will be seen, to certain sentences quoted above from Chaucer and Petrarch:

Her hath he honored as surely on earth no other is honored,
 None of the wives who in these our days keep house for their husbands.
 Heartily thus was she ever respected, and still is respected,
 Both by the Ruler himself and by all of her children beloved,
 Ay, and the people; for *all as a goddess regard her*, and greet her
 Ever with reverent words when she walketh abroad in the city.
Yea, and truly she lacks not at all of a good understanding:
Those she befriends, nay, even the men, their quarrels she endeth.

There is not only a likeness here, but it seems practically certain that Petrarch borrowed the trait from Homer, as Chaucer, in turn, borrowed it from Petrarch. Petrarch had been interested in Homer for several years. A Latin translation had been made for him, and the first instalment of the Odyssey reached him about the end of 1365, the rest following in 1367.¹ Portions of the Odyssey only a few lines later (Od. 7. 88 ff., 100-101) than those last quoted are referred to in Petrarch's

¹ Nollhac, *Pétrarque et l'Humanisme*, 2d ed., 2. 164-5. Petrarch's copy of the Iliad was being illuminated while he was in Pavia on the occasion of the wedding of Lionel and Violante (see my monograph, *The Last Months of Chaucer's Earliest Patron*, pp. 74 ff.); cf. Nollhac 2. 166; 1. 118.

treatise, *De Avaritia Vitanda*,¹ and the account of the Phæacian feast (Od. 7. 136 ff.) is touched upon in his poem of Africa (3. 375-6):

Talis apud mensas (nisi testem spernis Homerum)
Cena fit Alcinoi; sedet illic blandus Ulysses.

Having finished a marginal commentary upon the *Iliad*, death overtook him while he was still engaged upon a similar comment on the *Odyssey*, the point actually reached being Od. 2.242.

Here, then, the spirit of mediævalism, in one of its most consummate creations, borrows a stroke from the earliest Grecian antiquity, and heightens the portrait of Janicula's daughter, a 'povre creature', sprung from a peasant 'which that was holden povrest of hem all', by a trait belonging to Arete, queen of the lordly Phæacians, and great-grand-daughter of Poseidon, the Earth-shaker.

Chaucer is usually credited with only three allusions to Homer (Il. 3. 277; 12. 17; 24. 527), all derived from Boethius (Skeat, *Oxford Chaucer* 6. xcvi).

ALBERT STANBURROUGH COOK.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

¹ Cf. Körting, *Petrarca's Leben und Werke*, p. 476; *Petrarch, Opera*, 1581, p. 550 (= Sen. 6. 8 Frac.). Other references to the *Odyssey* will be found in Sen. 1. 5; 4. 5; 8. 3; 9. 1; 12. 2 (1); 15. 3 (14.4), according to Nollhac (2. 169, note 2; cf. 1. 204. For the subject in general, see Nollhac 2. 161 ff.

VI.—NEW COLLATION OF PARISINUS 7900 A FOR THE EPISTLES OF HORACE.

Certain variations from Keller and Holder's collation of Parisinus 7900 A, as given in their critical edition of the Odes and Epodes of Horace (1899), were printed in A. J. P., Vol. XXIII, No. 1. For the sake of completeness the following variations for the Epistles are now printed. It is unlikely that a second edition of the Epistles will be forthcoming soon. The ms. does not contain the Satires and gives only part of the first book of the Epistles.

EPISTLES I.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1, 42, videns A, vides A <i>corr.</i> | 13, <i>Inscriptio.</i> Not to be assigned to A. In modern hand. |
| 79, vivaria A. | |
| 95, occurit A. | |
| 2, 1, scriptorem A. | 14, 37, quomodo A. |
| 5, destinet A, detinet A <i>corr.</i> | 40, mavis A <i>corr.</i> |
| 7, conlisa A ₁ , collisa A ₂ . | 15, 4, perluor A. |
| 12, Pelliden A, Peliden A <i>corr.</i> | 15, paerrennes A, perrennes A <i>corr.</i> |
| 49, possessor A, possessor A <i>corr.</i> | 17, perfer A, perferre A <i>corr.</i> |
| 51, et] ut A. | 17, patiquae A, patique A <i>corr.</i> |
| 53, dolentes A. | 26. No evidence that a new letter begins here. |
| 65, ira A. | 38-45 A gives verses in following order, using K. and H.'s numbering: 38, 43, 44, 39, 40, 41, 42, 45. A ₂ gives order as in K. and H.'s edition (1864). |
| 65, eque A, eques A <i>corr.</i> | 16, <i>Inscriptio.</i> Ad quintum A. |
| 3, 4. Not to be identified with A ₁ . The entire line is supplied by a modern hand. A strip of vellum has been cut out. | 13, thraecam A, thracam A <i>corr.</i> |
| 31, minatus A. | 13, neo A. |
| 5, 5, menturnas A. | 34, detrahit A ₁ , detrahet A ₂ . |
| 12, fortuna A. | 40, mendicā A ₁ , mendacem A ₂ . |
| 18, addocet A. (Hole in ms.) | 51, opetum A ₁ , opertum A ₂ . |
| 6, 5, terrae A. | |
| 12, mútuatne A. | |
| 26, et omis A, et A ₂ . | |
| 29, fugum A. | |

- 52, bonis A.
 56, damnū A.
 65, qui A.
 17, 10, quis A.
 15, fastidiret A.
 33, hostis A, hostes A₂.
 44, sumasne A.
 18, 5, propeius A₁, propemaius A₂.
 7, tonsa cute A.
 12, voce set A, voces set = voces et A₂.
 14, partis A₁, partes A₂.
 35, officios A₁, officium A₂.
 36, agit A₁, aget A₂.
 46, Aetoliis A₁, Aetolis A₂.
 53, quiractet A₁, quitractet A₂.
 62, fertur A₁, refertur A₂.
 67, egestu A.
 69, garulus A₁, garrulus A₂.
 81, tuerisque A₁, tuterisque A₂.
 82, ecquid A.
 87, metuit A₁, metuet A₂.
 90, manuumq. A₁, navumq. A₂.
 100, doctrina A.
 108, dii A₁, di A₂.
 19, 5 dulces soluerunt A₁, dulces soluerunt = dulces soluerunt A₂.
 15, Timagenis A.
 18, liberent A₁, biberent A₂.
 19, imitatores A.
 20, vilem A₁, bilem A₂.
 20, iocum A.
 30, quaerit A.
 35, scine A₁, scire A₂.
 35, ignatus A₁, ignatus A₂.
 41, illae A.
 49, fune A₁, funebre A₂.
 20, 13, ILERDUM A₁, on margin to right.

M. S. SLAUGHTER.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

- T. Lucretius Carus. Of the Nature of Things, a metrical translation, by WILLIAM ELLERY LEONARD. London, Paris and Toronto: J. M. Dent & Sons, Limited; New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. [1916]. Pp. XV+301. Frontispiece. 4s. 6d.

So far as I can now recall, this is the first translation, or at all events the first important translation of the entire poem of Lucretius into English verse which has appeared since Creech's time, two centuries ago. For this reason alone the new version might well deserve a more extensive treatment than can be given it in this brief notice.

The translation is preceded by a Preface (VII-XII) and by a sonnet 'To the Master'. A large proportion of the Preface is taken up with some more or less obvious remarks on the art of translation in general. To my own thinking the space devoted to this lucubration could have been occupied to much greater advantage by something else. For example, as a translator of Lucretius, Professor Leonard might have devoted at least a paragraph to his own predecessors; and as a professor of English, he is doubtless able to speak with authority regarding the influence of this great poet on our literature. To be sure there is one brief reference to Munro, but I confess feeling a certain vague resentment at the somewhat cryptic expression, 'meticulous impeccability', which is bestowed upon that great translation.

In the two Italian phrases quoted from Carlo Giussani, 'abbondanza Lucretiana' (p. IX) should be 'abbondanza Lucreziana' and 'evidentimente' (p. 117 n.) should be 'evidentemente'. 'Carlo Guissani' appears in the first line of the Preface and this is the form in which the name of the great Lucretian scholar, Carlo Giussani, occurs throughout the entire book. 'Mens praecipit oculos', as Quintilian says, and as we ourselves learn to our sorrow when we undertake to correct our own proof.

The metrical form used by Professor Leonard is blank verse, and this, it seems to me, is a wise choice. Blank verse is adjustable to many moods, and one needs such a form if one is to translate a poet like Lucretius, who in descriptive bits can rise to the empyrean and yet in dogmatic passages can vindicate his

right to be called one of the clearest and most logical thinkers in the entire history of philosophical speculation.

In discussing Professor Leonard's version it may be interesting to note that in his opinion 'The translator of Lucretius (p. XI) is struck with the curious mixture of archaic and colloquial expressions, with the frequent rhymes, and with that insistent alliteration which the delicate art of the next generation was to subdue to a quiet allusiveness'. Students of Ennius and of the earlier literature will not be so deeply impressed by this statement. Moreover it is a well-known fact that the differences in style and form between Lucretius the poet and Lucretius the philosopher are too marked to be accidental. Professor Leonard's *aperçu*, however, has an interest of its own. It suggests that some of the more striking peculiarities of his style as a translator are deliberate attempts to reproduce what he conceives to be the tone of his original. Certainly whatever else it may be, his own style is a 'curious mixture of archaic and colloquial expressions'. Here we have (p. 220) 'the bodies of the strong-y-winged', there (p. 239) 'What erst was of a price, becomes at last a discard of no honour'; here (p. 93) 'Those scriven leaves of thine', there (p. 32) 'Bones to be sprung from littlest bones minute'. Sometimes the colloquialism is due to literal translation, as in V, 1-2,

Quis potis est dignum pollenti pectore carmen
condere pro rerum maiestate hisque repertis?

which he renders,

O who can build with puissant breast a song
Worthy the majesty of these great finds?

Of course, 'finds' is an absolutely literal translation of 'reper-tis'. But as not infrequently occurs in such oddly literal examples, 'finds' does not belong to the stylistic sphere of 'reper-tis' at all; like 'discard' in the phrase just quoted, it does not, in my own opinion, belong in the same sphere with Lucretius at any time. On the contrary it reminds one distantly of

crudum manduces Priamum Priamique pisinnos

which was Labeo's rendition of Homer's (Iliad, 4, 35),

ὤμῶν βεβρώθους Πρίαμον Πριάμοιο τε παῖδας.

'Inland rivers, far and wide away' (p. 10) is only one of many lines that might be quoted illustrating the marked tendency of colloquial speech to group prepositions. I am inevitably reminded of a rustic tale once told me in which I was informed among other things that 'George went down around in back of the barn every time he took a smoke'. Indeed, the occurrence of such words as 'ilk', 'thunder-heads', etc., suggest local dialects as well as colloquial usage to the ordinary reader.

Professor Leonard has a tendency to make favourites of words like 'sturdy', and 'skiey', to affect such compendia as 'tmust', and such rarities as 'wrinklest'. On the whole his vocabulary is odd rather than striking, and unusual rather than poetical. He is very fond of the word 'percase', he tells of 'chariots . . . areek With hurly slaughter' (p. 115), his 'ploughman . . . crackles, prating, how the ancient race' (p. 89), 'Space . . . extends Unmetered forth in all directions round' (p. 48), 'caeli regionibus I, 64 appears as 'region skies' (p. 5), 'solis praeclara luce' II, 1032 as 'the splendour-sun' (p. 83), 'altas turris ruere' V, 307 as 'the lofty towers ruin down' (p. 199). If it were not for the original 'repetunt oculis (which he reads with Creech instead of ollis) gestum pede convenienti' IV, 791, it would be difficult for the average man to know what in the world was meant by such a phrase as 'With speedy motion and with eyeing heads' (p. 165). What is an eyeing head? Indeed, it would sometimes seem, to paraphrase freely from Professor Leonard's own sonnet, 'To the Master', that his sturdy voice of still unconquered youth hath in an unknown tongue reported Lucretius. Certainly there is very little here of the strange solitary majesty of Lucretius, and only a distant echo now and then of those wonderful phrases which stirred the imagination of men like Vergil, Horace, and Ovid, which suggested to Spenser some of his finest lines and which occasionally shine in the great Dryden when he is at his best. Nevertheless, I gladly agree with Professor Leonard's critic in the *Spectator* that 'he has faced a very difficult task with much real success'.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Works to the Italian Works of Boccaccio, by HUBERTIS M. CUMMINGS. University of Cincinnati Studies X; Cincinnati, 1916.

The subject of Mr. Cummings's dissertation, which is published in the latest of the University of Cincinnati Studies, is one to arouse the very greatest interest and expectation. For next to the matter of French influence, the problem of Italian sources is perhaps the most important in the Chaucerian field. But considering the full nature of the questions involved, and realizing that we have a right to expect the most delicate and acute criticism if anyone takes upon himself the burden of such an investigation, one cannot feel that Mr. Cummings has satisfied our hopes in this volume.

Legitimately enough perhaps, the chief point of the book is to minimize the influence of Boccaccio on Chaucer. The author takes up the various works of the former by turns and states as completely as he is able the extent of their contributions to Chaucer's poems. In a laudable fashion he accepts none of the old conclusions in regard to borrowings but turns over all the old material for a reëxamination of its soundness, leaving ultimately as established Chaucer's indebtedness to only the *Filostrato* and the *Teseide*. All this would be splendid and indeed worth while if we could feel that Mr. Cummings's judgment were trustworthy; but very soon we discover that we cannot.

His first chapter restudies the thesis proposed by Professor Young that Chaucer used the *Filocolo* in parts of *Troilus* and *Criseyde*. He repeats the parallels cited by Young—the seven for the love-scene, and in these he detracts slightly from their force individually but he does not upset the argument derived from them taken all together. The only parallel regarding which he seems to make his point is the first, where he gives striking evidence to show that the *Filostrato* might be considered as furnishing sufficient material in itself, and this would be a good preparation for the rest of his case if that only proved to be equally tenable. In discussing the fourth parallel, however, he misrepresents or misunderstands Young's argument. Cummings shows that the jealousy of *Troilus* on account of *Horaste* is not comparable to or related to the jealousy of *Florio* on account of *Fileno*. Young was really not concerned with such an equation at all, but with the use of the name *Horaste* by *Pandarus* and the assurance in response given by *Criseyde* as related to the assurances given by *Biancifiore* to *Florio* in the equivalent scene. Finally Cummings does not mention, much less deal with, the long list of almost verbal parallels between the *Troilus* and the *Filocolo* at the place where the *Filostrato* differs, which are in their way really more remarkable than even the quite remarkable episodic parallels. It cannot be said, then, that Cummings's work here upsets a conclusion which has for some time been almost universally accepted by Chaucerian scholars, or that it deals with the problem even fairly or adequately, and this is one of the most important contributions which the dissertation attempts to make.

The second of these contributions is found in the comparison of the *Troilus* with the *Filostrato* itself. He does give a proper answer to Legouis' totally mistaken criticism of the English poem; but he is himself certainly very far from the truth when he says in his study of Chaucer's characters as compared with Boccaccio's that "There are really no preponderant differences in the characterizations of the two groups". This matter has been treated sufficiently by scholars in the past, for instance by Kittredge in his chapter on the *Troilus* in Chaucer and his

Poetry—a work curiously not referred to at all in the study, while Dodd's book on *Courtly Love* is cited as the chief authority. He neglects to pay any attention to Chaucer's additions at the end of the *Troilus*, so far as pointing out their philosophical significance is concerned, and yet these additions change the whole character of the poem from a sentimental to a rational tragedy.

Omissions of a similar kind appear in his study of the adaptation of the *Teseide*. Suggestions long ago offered by Ten Brink in regard to the character of Arcite as Chaucer transformed it, might here have been discussed and perhaps developed. It may be useful to stop here and point out some of the changes in Arcite. In Boccaccio, this figure appears as a more or less mewling, peevish hero, who wails a good deal about his fate, who tries to avoid fighting, and who speaks a long lament on his own mishaps. In Chaucer's poem, Arcite is thoroughly manly; his manhood demands that he shall fight; and as to fate, although he sighs like an orthodox lover, he says:

Allas, why pleynten folk so in commune
Of purveyaunce of God or of Fortune,
That yeveth hem ful ofte in many a gyse
Wel bettre than they can hemself devyse? (ll. 1251 ff.)

Ten Brink expressed the contrast with the remark that, "Arcite . . . becomes much more positive and violent in his (Chaucer's) hands"; it seems to me that he also becomes more of a man. In general, in both poems—the *Troilus* as well as the *Knight's Tale*—Chaucer shows himself as the stronger, perhaps more virile, and also cleaner and fresher story-teller. Boccaccio, as we might expect, is softer and more voluptuous, sometimes sickly and tearful. No such contrast in tone is hinted by Cummings.

Further details in the study reveal no less weakness in grasping the issues involved. Little is done with the Lollius question. Cummings is inclined to hold to the old view that Chaucer did not know Boccaccio's name—an idea which seems inconceivable remembering Chaucer's trips to Italy and his extensive interest in the Italian poet. Even Lydgate knew who Boccaccio was. But enough of this; there is already plenty to show that this study of the Italian field will not get us very far in our desire to know of Chaucer's relations with Boccaccio. While much in the book shows that pains have been taken and that the author has wished to leave no stone unturned in regard to matters of Chaucer's borrowings, the study will not serve even as the latest—much less the last—word on the subject. In some places it does not seem to be properly brought up to date in documentation—references to articles on questions in point are often

omitted: such as, to Young's article on the possible influence of Sercambi,' and Hinckley's preliminary suggestion, or to the numerous articles on the problem of Trophée.

HOWARD R. PATCH.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE, BRYN MAWR, PENNA.

An Introduction to the Study of Language, by LEONARD BLOOMFIELD, Assistant Professor of Comparative Philology and German in the University of Illinois. X+335 pages. 12mo. \$1.75. Henry Holt and Company. 1914.

Leonard Bloomfield's book is intended to offer the general reader and the student who is entering upon linguistic work a summary of what is now known about language, such as Whitney's *Language and the Study of Language* and *The Life and Growth of Language* did a half-century ago. There is need of a book that sets up the goal which Bloomfield has set himself. We have no one book of the nature of Whitney's which embodies for us the results of the great progress of linguistic science in the last fifty years. Unlike most other writers on linguistics, but like Whitney, the author does not limit himself to the treatment of one language group, such as Indo-European, but takes up the various possible modes of human expression. There is probably no one other factor which is so conducive to the transforming of the ordinary uninteresting, meaningless details of phonology and morphology of a single language into living phenomena fraught with interest, as this comparative method of attack. In accordance with the general direction which progress in linguistic study has taken since Whitney, the author emphasizes the importance of phonetics and of the modern psychological interpretation of language. He treats in ten chapters the following topics: 1. nature and origin of language; 2. physical basis of language; 3. mental basis of language; 4. forms of language; 5. morphology; 6. syntax; 7. internal change in language; 8. external change of languages; 9. teaching of languages; 10. study of language.

It is perhaps partly due to the necessity of using the technical terminology of scientific psychology and of constantly linking psychological doctrine with linguistic phenomena that Bloomfield's style does not always have the simplicity and clearness of Whitney's. Also in another related respect he has emulated neither his great predecessor nor that other master of linguistic science, Hermann Paul. Both these scholars choose their

examples from their respective mother-tongues. Bloomfield does not avail himself, as he might, of this pedagogical advantage of proceeding from the known to the unknown. It is well known how intangible phonetics seems to the beginner and that here, if anywhere, the starting-place should be familiar sounds and articulations. It may reasonably be assumed that besides English a rather large percentage of the readers of this book will understand French, German, and Latin. Yet on p. 28 the bilabial spirant of Dutch and Spanish is discussed, that of South German is not mentioned; there follows a discussion of coronal articulation in Spanish, the modern languages of India, French, German, and finally English; on p. 29 the *r*-sound of Slavic, Italian, French, German is treated, then finally that of American English. Considerably more space is devoted to the Czech *r* than to the American. On p. 30 we find a description first of Slavic, then German and French, and finally of English *l*; on p. 32 the spirant pronunciation of *g* in modern Greek precedes that of German. Leaving the field of phonetics, we find (p. 132) examples chosen from Italian instead of from the more generally known Latin to illustrate how the ending of a word may show its gender. In exemplifying the use of the reflexive construction where we use the passive (p. 173), why place Russian before French? etc., etc.

As may be seen from these few examples, a more sparing use throughout the book of out-of-the-way illustrations would have been more conducive to clearness and would have added to the value of the book. It hardly seems necessary for the purposes of an "introduction" to discuss the dialectic differences in the use of numeratives in Chinese (p. 131), which have no essential bearing on the question at issue, or to discuss group-stress in French, Japanese, English, German, Russian, Czech, Icelandic, and Polish (p. 149), in short, to confuse the beginner by discussions of and illustrations from approximately *seventy* different languages and dialects.

The chapter on the Physical Basis of Language does not come up to the high standard of the rest of the book. A treatise on phonetics which lacks plates or diagrams of the vocal organs is, of course, handicapped to begin with. In his desire to give examples for every possible sound, an entirely unnecessary proceeding for the purposes of this book, the author often loses himself in a mass of intricate detail, as when he distinguishes between the manner of opening the glottis in some Armenian dialects and in Georgian, or tells that wide unrounded *u* "is said to be spoken also in Armenian and in Turkish", or recounts the occurrence of palatal stops in French dialects, Lithuanian, Hungarian, Spanish, Italian, and French. As above mentioned, the unknown regularly precedes the known.

The author's presentation of the positions of the glottis is at variance with the facts. "Both in whispering", says he, "and in ordinary speech the unvoiced sounds are pronounced with the glottis in its widest-open position, the muscles of the vocal chords being relaxed and the breath passing freely through the larynx: this, as we have seen, is also the position for regular breathing" (p. 26). As a matter of fact, with unvoiced sounds the vocal chords form an angle of about fifteen degrees, in ordinary breathing of about twenty-five degrees. The regular breathing position is not the "widest-open position". The latter, with a much greater angle than in normal breathing, is the position in violent breathing (after running, etc.) or in blowing.

The statement that the glottal stop "is used in German initially in the pronunciation of words that in writing begin with a vowel" (p. 24) is only partly true. The syllable beginning with a glottal stop must ordinarily be accented.

The author unnecessarily aggravates the difficulty encountered in trying to see the raising and lowering of the velum by directing the reader to breathe through both mouth and nose, and then pronounce 'ah'. It is much simpler to breathe through the nose alone and then to say 'ah'.

The discussion of the dentals is inexact. English and German d and t are coronal or dorsal, French d and t usually dorsal. The author gives all three as coronal (p. 28). It is doubtful whether n ever occurs as an entirely unvoiced sound in such words as *mint*, *snow*; certainly not "often" (p. 29).

Unsatisfactory, too, is the treatment of the blade sounds. For Bloomfield they are synonymous with what we call in Jespersen's terminology 'rill spirants', namely unvoiced s, voiced z, and the sibilants in *shall* and *azure*. But, as noted above, English, German, and French d and t are often or usually blade sounds. Why Bloomfield applies the name 'abnormal sibilants' to the sibilants in *shall* and *azure* I do not see.

The traditional division of sounds into 'consonants' and 'vowels' is given up (p. 33) in favor of the terms 'noise-articulations' and 'musical articulations'. I cannot see why the two conventional terms, which stand for something quite definite if they are understood, as they ordinarily are, as names for a manner of articulation, are "untenable for purposes of exact terminology", when the author admits that there is no definite boundary between the noise-articulations and the musical-articulations. Moreover, these latter terms belong properly to a treatment of phonetics emphasizing the acoustic side, while the author presents physiological phonetics.

The chapter on the Teaching of Languages seems out of place in this book. The author himself seems to have felt this,

for he drops the objective scientific tone otherwise observed and adopts a polemical one. It is presumably to this fact that such over-statements may be ascribed as "Of the students who take up the study of foreign languages in our schools and colleges, not one in a hundred attains even a fair reading knowledge, and not one in a thousand ever learns to carry on a conversation in the foreign language." While not of the opinion that this chapter on technical modern language pedagogy belongs here, the reviewer is heartily in accord with most of the views expressed. Briefly but convincingly the author shows the essential fallacy of the grammar-translation method as a "process of logical reference to a conscious set of rules" and "as a method of study, . . . worthless, for it establishes associations in which the foreign words play but a small part as symbols (inexact symbols, of course) of English words". He then sketches how the direct method grows out of "a conscious or unconscious accordance with the fundamental processes of language learning and, for that matter, of speech in general". On a basis of sound psychology he explodes the myth that the power of learning languages wanes in adults.

In the following I shall take up some of the details in which the author seems to be in error or in which I disagree with him.

p. 4. The author speaks of the various systems of gesture-languages as "strikingly uniform". While not saying so in so many words he seems to imply that they are mutually intelligible. Wundt, upon whom the author "depends for his psychology, general and linguistic" (cf. Preface), says of the gesture-language of the South Italians that it is closely akin to that of savages in that many gestures have only symbolical significance, "wenn sie auch infolge der sehr verschiedenen Kulturbedingungen in der Beschaffenheit der gebrauchten Symbole erheblich abweicht" (Wundt: *Völkerpsychologie*, I. Band, 1. Teil, 3. Auflage, p. 154). A Dakota Indian, for instance, would not understand a Neapolitan, even though he would sooner understand the gestures than the sound-language (Wundt p. 157).

p. 8. The noise made by crickets is cited as a type of audible expressive movement; Wundt says, "die Geräusche vieler Insekten, die . . . durch das Aneinanderreiben horniger Teile des Hautskeletts entstehen, (gehören) weder nach ihren physiologischen Bedingungen noch wahrscheinlich nach ihrer psychologischen Funktion hierher" (p. 259).

p. 13. Even if the author follows Wundt in seeing the origin of language in audible expressive movements accompanying first pain and rage, then other intense emotions, he should not neglect to mention that Wundt says of recent investigations in this field, "dass sie durchweg eine wiederum

wachsende Hinneigung der allgemeinen Meinung zur Nachahmungstheorie bekunden" (2. Band, 2. Teil, p. 632).

p. 102. An instance of how language interpretation may go astray if it neglects historical method may be seen in the author's treatment of sound-variation in word-initial in Irish. He speaks of the semantic difference between the short forms of French *vous* and *a* and the longer ones employed in liaison, and then goes on to say, "An instance still farther along towards semantic differentiation occurs in Irish. This language has a sound-variation in word-initial which, however, does not depend upon the phonetic character of the preceding word-final, but arbitrarily on the preceding word; that is, Irish words may be divided into a number of otherwise arbitrary classes, according to the effect they have on a closely following word-initial. . . . This variation has semantic value in that it does not depend automatically on the adjoining sounds but implies a division of words into classes, etc." He gives as illustrations: *tá ba* 'there are cows' but *a va* 'his cows'; *uv* 'an egg', *an tuv* 'the egg', *na nuv* 'of the eggs', *a huv* 'her egg', on p. 128 *bó* 'cow', *an vó* 'the cow', *ar mó* 'our cow', etc.

From the standpoint of elementary Modern Irish grammar the author's statements might be allowed to pass. Seen from the historical point of view, however, these variations in word-initial do depend on the phonetic character of the original preceding word-final. Most of the examples come under the following three rules of Irish sandhi:

1. lenition or aspiration: an initial stop sound was changed to an aspirate or a spirant after a word originally ending in a vowel. Here belong such examples as *a va* 'his cows', etc.

2. nasalization or eclipsis: after all words originally ending in -n, the nasal was pronounced before an initial vowel and the mediae. (This is only part of the rule). This explains *na nuv* 'of the eggs', the n being the original ending of the genitive plural; likewise *ar mó* 'our cow', the homorganic m appearing before b, and, in Irish, mb regularly becoming by assimilation mm or m.

3. gemination: after words which originally ended in -s or postvocalic t and k sounds. It is too complicated a phenomenon to be discussed fully here, but the result before an accented initial vowel was an h sound. This is the explanation of *a huv* 'her egg', a being an old feminine genitive.

an tuv is a parallel to English *an egg*, *a cow*, *ant* being used before vowels, *an* before consonants.

I do not wish to deny that these sandhi phenomena appear most consistently within semantically related groups; these, however, are not 'arbitrary classes' but depend automatically on the original adjoining sounds.

p. 109. When the author takes the three 'genders' of nouns as an illustration of "word classes which are not expressed by formational similarity at all, but seem to go back, none the less, to emotional associations of the speakers", I believe the uninitiated reader is still uninitiated.

p. 145. "The Slavic languages distinguish categorically between, on the one hand, durative and iterative (in Slavic grammar called, together, 'imperfective') action . . . and on the other hand, punctual and terminative action (in Slavic grammar, together, 'perfective')". The author quotes here only the view of one school of Slavic grammarians, such as, for instance, Vondrak in his *Altkirchenslawische Grammatik*; Leskien, on the other hand, divides into 1. imperfective, 2. perfective, 3. iterative, but states that the iterative may be imperfective or perfective.

"He burst out weeping" does not strike me as 'inceptive terminative' but rather as 'inceptive durative'.

p. 145. In the list of Sanskrit 'conjugations' the *denominative* is omitted. The fact that it is not formed from the verb from which the other examples are derived is no reason for not including it in the list.

p. 152. As an example of stress-variation used as a means of morphologic sound-variation the author cites *address* with accent on the first syllable as noun, on the second as verb. The reviewer has often heard the former pronunciation, but it is not considered "correct".

p. 158. I think it unfortunate that the author feels it necessary to use the term *kernel* in place of the now generally used name *root*. It is loose usage to make *stem* and *root* synonymous, as is done here.

p. 206. In primitive Germanic the nominative and accusative singular of 'stone' are not **stainoz*, **stainon* respectively, but **stainaz* and **stainan*.

p. 220. In the discussion of the influence of language mixture in producing change in articulation, the substitution of the Indian for the Spanish basis of articulation in Chile is an interesting parallel to the assumed mingling of peoples speaking Dravidian and Indo-European languages. (Cf. R. Lenz: *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Amerikanospanischen*, *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* XVII, 158-214).

p. 224. The author prefers the name 'false analogy' to 'analogy', "because it conveys at least the idea of innovation, as opposed to the regular assimilative processes by which all speech is formed". The term 'false analogy' was given up in linguistics when the old belief, that analogical change like all language change indicated a deterioration of speech, was given up. Analogy is a regular process in all speech formation, so that there seems to be no ground for resuscitating the old expression.

p. 225. There is no basis for assuming that the numeral *four* in Primitive Indo-European may have begun with a uvular stop sound.

p. 229. Why the plural of Pre-Germanic **was* is **wēzumé* here but **wēzumún* on p. 216 is not clear. However, either form is possible.

The author brings his task to a close by giving the reader good practical hints on how to begin the study of linguistics.

This "Introduction to the Study of Language" cannot help but be of great profit to the serious student. It is what the author intended it to be, "a summary of what is known about language". The whole book bears witness to the rare scholarship of the author. My regret is that he has not succeeded in making it in the best sense of the word "popular".

ALBERT W. ARON.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

REPORTS.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE, Vol. XL (1916), 1 and 2.

Pp. 5-17. Louis Havet. Entractes dans Térence. Donatus, our authority for the division of the plays of Terence into five acts—a division for which there is no MS warrant—is not always faithful to his own criterion of the close of an act, to wit, an empty stage. In the vulgate there is a flagrant violation of the rule at Ad. 854 where old Demea remained on the stage after he had been called in by his brother—'i ergo intro'—a blunder that escaped even the critical eye of Bentley. There are yet other displacements—a further instance in the Adelphi, one in the Eunuchus, a third in the Andria, but we are assured that these are all that occur in the six plays. The cause of these displacements is to be sought in the transition from the distribution of the different acts among the performers to the continuous text for the behoof of the readers.

Pp. 18-32. Georges Lafaye. Le Modèle de l'Hécyre. There is a general agreement among scholars that the Hecyra of Terence is based upon the 'Εκυρά of Apollodoros of Carystos. But was there a secondary model and a consequent *contaminatio*? According to Sidonius Apollinaris, the secondary model was the 'Επιτρέποντες of Menander. The general theme of the Hecyra is so familiar to the *palliata* that it would readily admit extension and modification so that borrowing from the 'Επιτρέποντες was not a cogent necessity. Of this play of Menander, one of the most popular in Byzantine times <A. P. V 281, comp. A. J. P. XXXVIII 66> we have recovered some six hundred verses and it is strange that there is no verse, no expression that shows evident imitation of the 'Επιτρέποντες. The *dramatis personae* have a family likeness and yet in the one similar scene the handling is very different. After all, Sidonius Apollinaris speaks of 'similis' not 'eiusdem argumenti'. There may have been a 'Εκυρά of Menander but the *Graeca Menandru* of the Bembinus is too vague. In those later days Apollodoros of Carystos was a mere name. Even in Terence's time the title of the 'Εκυρά may have run 'Απολλοδώρου ἢ Μενάνδρου and that would account for the poet's failure to mention his originals as he has frankly done elsewhere in his prologues. The cutting mentioned by Donatus (v. 825) has been attributed to a dislike on the part of the poet to bring a courtesan and matron face to face. The explanation given

by Donatus is doubtless the correct one. Profiting by previous experience, Terence resolved to abridge the play, and in fact the Hecyra is by far the shortest of the six pieces.

Pp. 33-37. François Garin. On the Greek MS Coislin 169 of the Bibliothèque Nationale. This MS containing Theocritus Id. I-XVIII and Moschus III does not deserve the consideration it has received at the hands of scholars from St. Amand to W. Christ. It is nothing but a copy of Laurentianus XXXII 16, a MS of the XIII century.

Pp. 37-46. Salomon Reinach. How one ceased to be a *colonus*. There were three periods of Roman colonization. Down to the time of the Gracchi the *coloni* were peasant soldiers and soldier peasants, the élite of the agricultural population. At the time of the Gracchi and Marius, the colonizers were the *plebs urbana* and professional soldiers, a poor lot of drifters and of worn-out men. The third and worst period was inaugurated by Marcus Aurelius, the most virtuous of Roman emperors and the unconscious instrument of the ruin of the Empire. In consequence of the long wars on the Danube and the frightful pestilence that devastated a large part of the Roman Empire the colonists were made up of German barbarians and transplanted masses of conquered populations. But at no period was there that 'return to the soil', which was supposed to be the ultimate inspiration of Vergil's Georgics. The *plebs urbana* wanted *panem et Circenses*—wanted the net result of the agriculture, not the agricultural life itself. But were the colonists permitted to sell or lease their lands? This was expressly forbidden to the 'limitanei' or soldiers who occupied the territories which belonged to the state, but there is no direct evidence whether or not the older *coloni* could alienate their assignments.

Pp. 47-48. P. d'Hérouville. Aristotle Eth. Nic. B., 9, 1109, a, 35. Κατὰ τὸν δεύτερόν φασι πλοῦν. There are two interpretations of δεύτερος πλοῦς. 1. Rowing instead of sailing, a *pisaller*. 2. After failure, try, try again. Stewart in his notes on the Nicomachean Ethics quotes as conclusive proof of the correctness of the former interpretation Menander ap. Stob. Flor. II, p. 349 (Meineke). Still, the context of the Nic. Eth. does not exclude the latter interpretation though the former is more satisfactory for Pol. I 13, 1284 b, 19. Comp. also Phileb. 19 C. The rival interpretation is suggested by the schol. on Phaedo 99 D, so that it seems worth while to quote in support of the *pisaller* interpretation two passages of St. Chrysostom Adv. oppugn. vitae monast. III 1 and Homil. I in Matt. 1—passages which shew the persistence of the proverb after seven centuries.

Pp. 49-50. L. Laurand. The repetition of the relative pronoun in Greek. In Latin the consecrated rule of representing

the second relative by the demonstrative is as much honoured in the breach as in the observance. Comp. Lebreton R. de phil. XXVII (1903), <A. J. P. XXV 343 and as for that matter G. L. (1894) 636>. M. Laurand desiderates an exhaustive examination of the parallel Greek usage and cites for the repetition of the relative Dem. 37, 46; 38, 19; 40, 2; Plato, Protag. 313 A, Rpb. 374 B; 396 C; 477 D; <562 B>.

Pp. 51-54. Georges Méautis. ΩΚΕΑΝΕ. Oxyrh. Pap. I 41, 4 for *ωκαλαναι ωκααναι* (his) read *Ωκεανέ*. The Okeanos river of Homer and Hesiod had become to the Egyptians an equivalent of the Nile as a benefactor, as a nursing father.

Pp. 55-108. Georges Lafaye. Greek Litany of Isis. This interesting document published in a recent volume of the Oxyrh. Papyri is described, edited, and annotated with parallel passages from Apuleius and an index by the author of the paper, the wealth of which does not admit of condensation. Isis, patroness of suffragettes, had a wide cult in the second century as is shown by the long geographical introduction; the ascriptions are full of ritualistic music and one of them implies equality of men and women and is quite in accord with the spirit of our times.

Pp. 109-112. The Bulletin Bibliographique deals with Viljoen's Herodoti fragmenta in papyris servata, Herbert Richards' Aristotelica, Aigrain's Manuel d'épigraphie chrétienne.

Pp. 113-124. Pierre Boudreaux. Origin and formation of the scholia of Aristophanes. An anonymous grammarian towards the fourth-fifth century constituted the text of the eleven comedies and compiled the commentaries of Heliodoros, Symmachos, Phaeinos and sundry anonymous commentaries of varying number and value. He transcribed text and annotations on a parchment codex which became the archetype of our Byzantine recension. But by contaminations which were made during succeeding centuries, by collations of MSS of other provenience, by conjectures, by later additions, the copies of the same recension have been loaded unequally with foreign elements and the initial unity quickly gave place to a new diversity.

Pp. 125-132. Louis Havet. Plautus, Amph. 418, for 'a Telebois' read 'af Telebois'. Bacch. 51, before 'unum' insert 'hunc' and for 'perii' ex coni. read with Ritschl 'prope'. Cas. 311, for 'quam istam' read 'qua tu'. Cist. 7, read am <bae a m>e. Epid. 353, read *His denumeraui manibus*, is suam natam quam esse credit. Merc. 847, for 'inuenturus' read 'inuentus res' and for 'dedi' read 'dedit'. Pœn. 968 P (969 A) 969 P (968 A). The order of both A and P is faulty. 968 A is not by Plautus, and our text is the result of attempts

to fill a gap. Delete the peccant verse and read: Creta est profect<o anim>o horunc hominum oratio. Trin. 48: O amice <mi> salve. l. 296. for 'neu' and 'neue' read 'nei' and 'neiue'. In like manner 183 read 'sei' for 'seu'. 538 for 'omnia mea' read 'omnia mala'. Truc. 181 read:

Amantes si qui non danunt, non didici fabulari.

... Amanti si cui quid dabo, "non est" non didici fari.

P. 132. Louis Havet defends 'parcepromus' against 'parci-promus' on the analogy of 'genetrix', and integrum. The *e* is due to the influence of the contiguous *r*.

Pp. 133-134. Franz Cumont. Isis Latina. In the Isis Litany v. 104 for Δαείνῃν read Αναείνῃν (= 'Αναείνῃν). In Persia the planet Venus was not consecrated to Isis but to Anahita. Yet according to certain astrological theories Venus was the star of Isis.

Pp. 135-137. Louis Havet. Cicero, Verrines. Emendations 4. 9. 16. 35. 49. 56. 65. 121.

Pp. 138-140. Louis Havet. Emendations to Aurelius Victor.

Pp. 140-141. Louis Havet. Emendations to Varro, R. R.

Bulletin Bibliographique, containing reviews of Fowler's Gathering of the Clans (A. J. P. XXXVIII 209 ff.). Paul Lejay says: 'Le livre de M. Fowler est un de ces livres ingénieux et séduisants que l'Angleterre nous donne souvent, et où se mêlent les fantaisies un peu risquées de l'amateur, les intuitions d'un lecteur sensible et la science éveillée d'un érudit sagace'. Cuq, Une statistique de locaux affectés à l'habitation dans la Rome impériale <A. J. P. XXXVIII 96 ff.>. Argumentation précise et solide (Victor Chapot). Cocchia, Lucio Apuleio (A. J. P. XXXVIII 317 ff.). The reviewer, M. Victor Chapot, is not convinced.

Revue des revues—which shews that the Revue de Philologie is encountering the same difficulties that have hampered the reports of the A. J. P.

B. L. G.

RIVISTA DI FILOLOGIA, XLV (1917).

Fascicolo 3.

Gli 'scholia vetera in Theocriti Idyllia' nel Codice Estense greco 87 (377-401). Francesco Garin discusses the value and relations of this manuscript and gives the variant readings. It contains a great many good readings. Curiously enough it anticipates a number of readings which in our modern text are due to the conjecture of later scholars.

La condizione giuridica della Grecia dopo la distruzione di Corinto nel 146 a. Ch. (402-423). Vincenzo Costanzi discusses the political condition of Greece after the departure of Mummius. The discussion is based on the summary given by Pausanias, VII 16, 9-10. Costanzi's conclusion is that when in 27 B. C. Greece was made the province of Achaea and given a proconsul of its own, the Romans merely gave official recognition to a state of things which had already existed for a long time.

Di un'epigrafe cristiana recentemente scoperta e di un graffito pompeiano restituito nella sua lezione (424-428). Pietro Rasi discusses at some length two inscriptions: a Christian epitaph published by Fornari in the *Notizie degli Scavi* 1916, p. 126, and a Pompeian graffito published by Della Corte in the same journal, p. 286.

Per l'epigramma in onore del pittore Marcus Plautius (429-431). Arnaldo Beltrami comments on the famous epigram in honor of the painter Marcus Plautius in the temple of Juno Regina at Ardea as reported by Pliny, N. H. XXXV, 115.

Post XL Annos (432-434). Ettore Stampini contributes a long and well written inscription commemorating his 40 years of academic life.

Recensioni (435-442).

Note bibliografiche (442-444).

Rassegna di pubblicazioni periodiche (445-453).

Pubblicazioni ricevute dalla Direzione (454-456).

Fascicolo 4.

Notizie di Papiri Ercolanesi inediti (457-466). Domenico Bassi publishes some few fragments of (Pap. 57) Philodemus, Π[ερί] Μα[ρί]ας. This is one of the few papyri, the author and title of which have been preserved. It was completely unrolled in 1805. The fragments of text here published are not especially significant and Bassi adds no commentary upon them.

Le "Fenicie" di Seneca (467-515). Umberto Moricca discusses the authenticity of the *Phoenissae* of Seneca, the theories of Leo, Braun, Werner, Heinse, Richter and others regarding the origin and present condition of the play, etc. His careful study of style, phraseology and situations convinces him and is likely to convince the reader that the play is by Seneca and that it was meant to be written just as it is. Particularly interesting is the comparison of the final scene with Livy's account of Coriolanus and his mother Veturia (Livy II, 39-40). Moricca makes it quite clear that Seneca was strongly influenced by this famous passage of the historian. The article is to be continued.

Cortesie da Desco (516-520). Luigi Valmaggi concludes that the use of the fork was not general in any period in antiquity. Certainly the Middle Ages were guiltless of it; in the Age of Elizabeth it was a curiosity; in this country it is less than a generation since the fork assumed a number of functions previously exercised by a knife. Indeed no longer ago than 1749 the author of a French book on deportment (quoted by Valmaggi) feels obliged to warn his gentle reader that "if they serve you meat it is not good manners to take it in your hand." Valmaggi also quotes another gem from Croce's *Cinquanta cortesie da tavola* (1609):

Cerca alla mensa star pulito e netto
E il naso mai in man non ti moccare
Ma porta teco sempre il fazzoletto.

There may be some who assume that warnings of this sort are unnecessary in this day and generation, but anyone who has lived long enough to look about him and remember what he sees is quite well aware of the fact that the naiveté of our forefathers by no means perished with them.

Nuovi riscontri classici al Parini (521-523). Luigi Valmaggi points out and discusses some of G. Parini's imitations of the classics (Mezzog. 462 ff.; Vespro 194 ff., *Alla Musa* 1).

Recensioni (524-528).

Note bibliografiche (528-529).

Rassegna di pubblicazioni periodiche (530-534).

Pubblicazioni ricevute dalla Direzione (535-536).

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

BRIEF MENTION.

For a number of years I might have called myself 'parcus <Sophoclis> cultor et infrequens'. Perhaps I was a little tired of expounding the perfections of the son of Sophilos, the only dramatist I taught in my regular classes during my twenty years' service at the University of Virginia (A. J. P. XXXVII 383). I cannot say, as did the late Dr. Verrall, that in Sophokles there was no man to be discovered behind the artist, at least no man whom he (Verrall) would greatly care to know (A. J. P. XXXV 492). Indeed at one time I should have shewn a Tam o' Shanter readiness to sacrifice what no Greek wore for 'ae blink' of that 'bonnie burdie' as he led the choral dance in honour of the victory of Salamis: and at a much later day I manifested my sympathy with Sophokles, the aged, by giving the right interpretation to that famous dictum about love which Cicero either did not or would not understand (A. J. P. XXX 4). Sophokles, the artist, I have toiled after in translation; and in my Essays and Studies I have undertaken to vindicate the actuality of his dramaturgy by an analysis of the career of Maximilian of Mexico. But for a considerable part of my teaching of Sophokles, Sophokles meant Jebb (A. J. P. XVII 390) and Jebb is another piece of perfection that has kept me these many years discontented with the crudeness of my own workmanship (A. J. P. XXVI 491); and, to confess a human weakness, I was comforted when after the great Grecian had withdrawn his cool radiance from lesser stars and flaring bonfires I read that in the eyes of a writer in Blackwood's Magazine Jebb's translations were bald. Bald! But so are the mountains of Greece and so are the chrysolite Isles of Greece. Thasos was wooded in the old times, ὕλης ἀγρίης ἐπιστεφής, but that was no recommendation in the eyes of Archilochos. Passing as I did once by a rather sudden transition from Greece to Heidelberg, I resented the lushness of the woodland scenery of Germany as one would resent hypertrichosis (A. J. P. XXXVII 108) on the face of a beautiful woman, not to cite the Μοῦσα παιδική.¹ To understand Jebb as to understand Sophokles demands study, demands insight and if from time to time I have tented holes in the great scholar's coat, it was only to assert the right of the humblest grammarian to in-

¹ A. J. P. XXXVIII 63.

dependent vision. I do not emulate the lint-picker of Jebb's Theophrastus (A. J. P. XXX 228). Neither σκορακισμός for the lowliest nor κροκνδισμός for the highest. Bald! Well! δότε τῷ φαλακρῷ.

To come back to my temporary neglect of Sophokles. It is after all well to lay an old favorite aside for a while. 'Voluptates commendat rarior usus' is as true of intellectual enjoyments, is as true of the enjoyments that come from reading, as of those meant by Lucretius. But there are haunting verses, haunting melodies that linger in the least tenacious memory. I am a Grecian at least to the extent that I value poetry for life—not as 'a criticism of life'. μὴ γένοιτο. My friends accuse me of a wearisome repetition of σμικρὰ παλαιὰ σώματ' εὐνάζει ῥοπή to which I have not been ashamed to give a sporty¹ translation (A. J. P. XXXI 147). The prayer ξὺν ἀσφαδάστῳ καὶ ταχεῖ πηδήματι has been on my lips and in my heart ever since I entered into the penumbra of old age and heard of the exit of a comrade of my youth (A. J. P. XXII 114), though I have been tempted to substitute πεσήματι for πηδήματι, too violent an action for an old scholar. Then there are verses that make strange music in one's ear. Tastes differ—but I have long loved these lines of Deianeira

ὦ Ζεῦ, τὸν Οἴτης ἀτομον δὲ λειμῶν' ἔχεις,
ἔδωκας ἡμῖν ἀλλὰ σὸν χρόνῳ χαράν.

with their play of stress and accent. Nor is the sentiment alien. The sense arrides me as well as the sound. For so much has come to me late in life, among other things this 'riant nook' of *Brief Mention*.

Of those 'coups de fouet' that cut to the heart, Sophokles is a past master. He is no whit behind Aischylos. I think of Iokasta's ἄλις νοσοῦσ' ἐγώ as I think of Cassandra's ἀρκεῖτω βίος. It is these dramatic μάστιγες, these stabs, as it were, that tell on the modern reader. χωρεῖ πρὸς ἥπαρ γενναία δύη. As for the γνῶμαι, those wise saws, of which the practical Greeks were so fond, those bits of proverbial philosophy which orators like Aischines seemed to consider the be-all and end-all of poetry—we can find all we want in the monostichs that Kock bundled out of his Comico-rum Attico-rum Fragmenta, we can find a lot of them in Publilius Syrus. The old editions are apt to mark these floscules of sententiousness. Taubmann's Plautus, the

¹For ῥέπειν in the field of 'sport', comp. Pind. O. 9, 98: δέυρεπεί δόλω.

first entire Plautus I ever owned, puts these admirable reflexions in majuscules—a capital arrangement for example hunters. 'Pauvre prestre', said Scaliger of Taubmann, 'son Plaute ne sera pas grand cas'. Still it is better to fish in Taubmann than to cast one's net at random in Lewis and Short, as some grammarians have done to their hurt.¹ Pindar has gnomes enough to stock a calendar but as has been urged and well urged, the dramatic situation must be studied and scholars should not imitate the good ladies who cite unthinkingly the strange woman of the Proverbs of Solomon. In a discourse by Viscount Bryce as President of the British Academy before the Great War got into full swing one reads these calmly philosophic words, which produce a strange effect when taken in connexion with the same eminent historian's subsequent report on matters in Belgium.

Every one among us must sometimes have had cause to regret, when reading them years afterwards, words which he wrote in the heat of the moment. Time modifies our judgment as it cools our passions. Neither the friendships nor the enmities of nations can last forever. You remember how Ajax, in the drama of Sophokles, says that he has learnt

ὁ τ' ἐχθρὸς ἡμῖν ἐς τοσόνδ' ἐχθαρτέος,
ὥς καὶ φιλήσων αὐθις.

It is a stock quotation. In his Recollections Lord Morley refers to the sentiment a couple of times though he is vague as to the source. Of the wisdom of that sage reflexion, who is better aware than one who sang with heart and soul a song very popular in a section of our common country once known as the Confederate States,

You can never win us back
Never, never,
Though we perish in the track
Of our endeavor?

ὥς καὶ φιλήσων αὐθις.

But in the mouth of Ajax the lines just quoted have the tang of Sophoklean bitterness than which there is little more bitter in all literature.

Much has been written about Euripides as a *δικανικὸς ποιητής*. But no fifth century Attic poet was free from the sophistic influence that made itself felt in every department of life. Aischylos was not free from it, nor Sophokles any more than his contemporary Herodotos. The Kreon of the Antigone is an archsophist, as has been noted. He had the same creed as the

¹ A. J. P. XXXII 116.

Pangermanist of to-day, and to those who hate to give up the Germany of other days, there is a certain comfort in reading what Goethe said to Eckermann: 'Man sollte überhaupt nie eine Handlungsweise eine Staatstugend nennen, die gegen die Tugend im allgemeinen geht'. The passage is cited in the tenth edition of the Schneidewin-Nauck *Antigone*. It will doubtless disappear from post-bellum editions, if there will be any post-bellum editions of the *Antigone* or any post-bellum for some of us oldsters.

From the first emergence of the word σοφιστής we have to do with rhetoric, which may be called the official robe of the sophist. A later development is the quest of ποικιλία, a subject which has interested me for years, an interest which has left traces in the *Journal* (e. g. XVI 92 f. n.; XXIX 120; XXXV 231). The antithesis to ποικιλία is repetition (παλιλλογία); not rhetorical anaphora but simple repetition without stress. The subject which I barely touched on in my *Pindar* (P. 1. 80; 9, 123) is taken up and expanded by Schroeder in his *Proleg.* II. 94. Repetition of this sort is common enough in Sophokles. It has nothing to do with the recurrent word, the so-called 'key word' (A. J. P. II 500; XII 94); nothing to do, for instance, with ἡ κακή φάτις which might be considered the motif of the *Ajax* (187-193) nor with the φρονεῖν (A. J. P. XXXVIII 337) recently discussed in the *Journal*. Variety for sheer variety's sake has been denounced by Pascal (A. J. P. XXIX 120) as foolery, and Johnson has been charged with it, often unjustly. We moderns are completely under the domination of the goddess Ποικιλία so that Campbell in treating of Repetition in Sophokles apologizes for what he calls 'accidental repetition'. 'Modern languages', he says, 'are more precise and exacting than the ancient . . . in not allowing the same word to be used twice, unless for special reasons, in the same passage. This requirement', he admits, 'runs counter to a natural proclivity, as all must be aware who have had occasion to correct a hastily written letter'. This mania for variation came in at a later period. Sophokles was too healthy to yield to what was originally artificial but has now become ingrained in all modern literature, and notably so in English style. Examples abound, but few are so frank as Mr. PATON in his translation of the *Anthology* VII 103:

καὶ βίωτος καθαρὸς σοφίας ἐπὶ θεῖον ἐκόσμη
αἰῶν' ἀστρέπτοις δόγμασι πειθόμενος.

He renders 'A pure pursuit of wisdom, obedient to their unswerving doctrines, adorned their divine lives'. 'Life', he

adds in a footnote, 'life is the Greek, but English will not bear the repetition'.

Well, we are all tarred with the same stick, sheep of the same fold. True, Sophokles, I fancy, would not have apologized for the repetition of χρόνῳ (El. 1292-3). A. J. P. XXXIV 106, line 11 from bottom, one reads: 'She too had caught the *music* and answered him in his own *music*'. But I am not to be credited with the second '*music*' for I am an unhealthy modern. I had written 'measure' and my friend, Professor Manatt, who happened to be interested in the passage pointed out the repetition as one would point out a typographical error. I have made a number of additions to Professor Campbell's lists and intended to compare Sophokles' usage with that of modern masters but the subject is well worn¹ and besides, before parting with Sophokles, I wish to make a note or two on Mr. PEARSON's edition of the fragments of the poet.

Mr. PEARSON, as we all know, is well qualified for his task, which he took up in succession to Walter Headlam, and Mr. PEARSON is a keen grammarian (A. J. P. XXXII 361 foll.). The Hellenist readers of the Journal will doubtless remember his article On the use of ὅταν with causal implication (A. J. P. XXXIII 426-433) to which he has referred repeatedly in his commentary on the fragments. It would have been asking too much of a rival interpreter that he should have added a reference to my discussion of the matter, which to his mind was neither novel nor convincing (l. c. 469 foll.). But in these notes I shall steer clear of grammar.

In his note on Sophokles' EPIΣ p. 139 Mr. PEARSON records Welcker's strange blunder in confounding Θέμυς, the πάρεδρος Διός (Pind. O. 8, 22), nay, the ἄλοχος Διός (fr. 30) with Θέτις for whose hand Zeus and Poseidon were rivals (I. 8, 27). After such a lapse one almost forgives Bréal (A. J. P. XXXVII 112) for making Thetis a daughter of Zeus. Dindorf, as Mr.

¹ However, as I am reading this *Brief Mention* in its final form, I see that a correspondent of the London Times (Jan. 17) has rushed into print in order to convince Tennyson of sin for repeating, within short compass, the word 'land' in his *Lotus Eaters* and has in like manner impaled Matthew Arnold for repeating the word 'streams' in *Sohrab and Rustum*; and the subject is resumed by A. B. Cook in the same newspaper for Jan. 31.

PEARSON notes, makes the same mistake but he might have added that Dindorf cites a passage from Plato, Rpubl. 2, 379 E which ought to have opened his eyes: οὐδὲ θεῶν ἔριν τε καὶ κρίσιν διὰ Θέμειός τε καὶ Διός and actually quotes the Θεομαχία. ἔριν was evidently too much for him and yet Mr. PEARSON has to say that Welcker opened a new epoch and that his book is as readable as it was when it was first printed. 'He was a great man' said Bolingbroke of Marlborough, 'and I have forgotten all his faults' (A. J. P. XXXIV 232). Otto Jahn compared Welcker's learning to the dust on a butterfly's wing. What if the dust got into his eyes sometimes? In the Educational Supplement to the London Weekly Times for November 8, 1917, there is a long article On the Significance of Howlers, the lesson being the folly of cramming children with proper names that have no real meaning for them. The significance of howlers in the case of professed scholars is far different. For one thing it is a lesson in the practice of ἐπιείκεια, an acquired virtue for most of us. The article is furnished with abundant and, of course, amusing illustrations, many of which can be capped by any one who has had dealings with printer's devil and ignorant copyist. Still where are the eyes of the proof-readers? In the ends of the earth? Hence the not infrequent lamentations of the Journal. Still there is some comfort to be had from some of the mistakes that cross the reader's path, such as Lesbian women for Lemnian women, strange bedfellows, and Cynic and Cyrenaic, which may be called a parallel. Flaxman's Parting of Nestor and Andromache set me off on an Imaginary Conversation after the pattern of Landor. If I had carried out my plan I should at least have avoided the confusion of Pindar with Simonides (A. J. P. XXXIV 238), and should not have quoted Ovid in a fifth century B. C. letter as he did in Pericles and Aspasia. But I would rather have written Rose Aylmer than a score of Greek Syntaxes, as I would rather have written A Shropshire Lad than edited Manilius. So readily does a man revert to his old loves.

No one who has had any experience in dealing with technical terms and processes in antiquity but has had occasion to get his knuckles rapped. My study of *examen* Pers. I 6, 7 is not a pleasant memory for me. Comp. Postgate, A. J. P. VI 462. And when it comes to ships and shipwrights, old salts and unvoyaged landlubbers alike are at odds, one can't say 'at sea'. I have a note on this apropos of Timotheos' Πέρσαι (A. J. P. XXIV 226). On Pindar N. 6. 57, Sir John Sandys has a long note about the meaning of πὰρ ποδί. The passage runs: τὸ δὲ πὰρ ποδί ναὸς ἐλισσόμενον αἰὲν κυμάτων | λέγεται παντὶ μάλιστα δονεῖν

θυμόν. As I have indicated (A. J. P. XXXVI 232) δονεῖν refers to seasickness, but the passage has been overlooked by Professor Rolfe in his article on that disagreeable disorder, not to repeat the word 'seasickness' (A. J. P. XXV 192-200). Every one who has been much at sea will recognize the propriety of the figure in his own case or that of others. In the same sphere my attention has been called to Mr. PEARSON's note on Sophokles, frag. 143:

ὡς ναοφύλακες νυκτέρου ναυκληρίας
πλήκτροις ἀπευθύνουσιν οὐρίαν τρόπιν.

Does ναυκληρία mean 'voyage' or as Campbell contends 'ship'? In either case Mr. PEARSON maintains that there is a pleonasm against which one of my correspondents rightly protests. The ναοφύλακες are the ship-watch mentioned P. 4.41, who doubtless took their turns at the rudder under the κυβερνήτης. ναυκληρία is the ship as Campbell maintains, ναύκληρος the master. PEARSON's 'pleonasm' recalls the blunder of Grote who mixed up ναύκληρος and κυβερνήτης in his interpretation of the famous similitude in Plato's Republic VI 488 and made a mess of it.

Dean WEST has collected the testimonies of a cloud of witnesses to the *Value of the Classics* (Princeton University Press), testimonies borne by men who have no commercial, no professional interest in the maintenance of the traditional scheme of college studies. Appended to these impressive deliverances there is a formidable array of statistics drawn up in refutation of those other statistics that have been used only too effectively to stir up the pure minds of believers in Latin and Greek. My missionary days are long overpast and statistics have lost whatever charm they had for me even in the syntactical line, but the book will strengthen the feeble knees of those who are afraid that they will have to bow down themselves in the house of Rimmon. Among the usual topics the inevitable question of translation comes up repeatedly. One of the most quotable passages is by Justice HOLMES who says (p. 233): 'It seems to me that people who think that they are enjoying Euripides, for instance, in the charming translations that we know, probably are getting their pleasure from a modern atmosphere that is precisely what is not in the original.' This is the judicial way of expressing what John Jay Chapman means when sometime ago he dared to call Gilbert Murray an 'ignis fatuus'. A Hoosier writer of note, to whom Gilbert Murray and the son of Kleito are as one, tells of the 'wild songs of Euripides'. There are wood-notes in Euripides but one hesitates at 'wild'. And the same

author quotes with ecstasy, not the somewhat prosaic tag with which Euripides winds up five of his plays with a contemptuous fling, as it were, at the departing spectators, but the poetical vesture with which the interpreter has endued the ἐξόδιον:

Great treasure halls hath Zeus in heaven,
From whence to man strange dooms be given,
Past hope or fear.
And the end men looked for cometh not,
And a path is there where no man thought:
So hath it fallen here.

Fifty years ago in a spirit of mischief I called this passage a 'wretched tail-piece' (*Essays and Studies*, p. 194), and wrote a burlesque version, which has been quoted and misunderstood. Here is a variant:

A box of surprises hath Zeus in the skieses,¹
And much that is odd 's fulfilled by the gods;
That comes not about for which you look out;
That God doth effect what you don't expect:
And such was the end of this story.

Honour bright, which is closer to the original?

W. P. M.: *Horace and his Age: A Study in Historical Background*. By J. F. D'ALTON, Professor at St. Patrick's College, Maynooth. Longmans, Green & Co.: London and New York, 1917. Pp. xii+296. \$2.00 net. This is a study of the serious side of Horace, an attempt "to view him in the light of the various movements of his time, to recapture, as it were, the atmosphere in which he moved, to estimate a portion at least of the influences under which many of his thoughts were bodied forth." The special topics discussed are, his position in Roman politics, his religion and philosophy, his attitude toward various social problems and various popular beliefs, and his work as a literary critic. It is shown that Horace, as long as he continued to write, reflects, with a good deal of fidelity, the various phases of Roman Imperial policy, that his philosophic thought in the *Epistles* is predominantly Stoic, etc. The last chapter contains a very careful study of the development of drama at Rome. The whole book is well written, and well made.

¹ A meticulous writer, I always seek literary warrant for anything unusual. With 'skieses' compare 'treeses' in Addison's 'And the breezes fan the treeses | Full of blossoms bright and gay. (*The Guardian*, No. CXXIV.) 'Box of surprises' is a manner of equivalent for 'glory-hole', the name that ship-stewards give to their reserves of dainties, and so I have not been untrue to the *raplas*-motif of the original.

Another good book which should be promptly mentioned here is a very complete edition of the Eighth Book of Lucan's Civil War, by Professor J. P. POSTGATE, of the University of Liverpool (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1917. Pp. cxii + 146. 3s. net). The introduction treats of the last days of Pompey, with excursuses on the route and chronology of his flight, and on various questions of ethnography and geography; there are twelve pages of critical apparatus, and a hundred pages of explanatory notes. The book is very carefully printed; one lonely flaw is the omission of the word *ius* in the quotation from Seneca, 642 n. The note on *lapsus*, 8, is not very clear.

R. V. D. M.: Three new volumes of Chartes et Diplômes relatifs à l'Histoire de France have lately appeared. Under the imprint 1914 is the *Recueil des Actes de Louis IV, Roi de France* (936-954) by the archivist and palaeographer M. PHILIPPE LAUER. The introduction (pp. i-lxxv) discusses the Royal Chancellory, the palaeographical minutiae of the MSS, and the matter of the invocation, preamble, subject-matter, and protocol. Pages 1-151 are taken up with the texts themselves and the index, and that is followed by 8 plates of MS facsimiles, monograms, and seals.

Professor H. FRANÇOIS DELABORDE issued in 1916 the first volume of his *Recueil des Actes de Philippe Auguste, Roi de France*, Tome I, Années du règne I à XV (1^{er} Nov. 1179-31 Oct. 1194) (pp. XL+574), and M. ÉLIE BERGER published the posthumous work of M. LÉOPOLD DELISLE, *Recueil des Actes de Henri II, Roi d'Angleterre et Duc de Normandie, concernant les provinces françaises et les affaires de France*, Tome I (pp. VII+587). These two large volumes are a continuation of the splendid series being published under the care and direction of L'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres.

In the Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres (Tome XL) there has also just appeared a short but valuable study by M. HENRI OMONT, under the title *Minoïde Mynas et ses missions en Orient* (1840-1855).

Under the auspices of the same academy there appeared in 1915, Tome V of the *Recueil des Historiens de la France*, entitled *Pouillés de la province de Trèves*, published by MM. AUGUSTE LONGNON and l'abbé VICTOR CARRIÈRE (pp. LXVIII+600). This carefully edited volume contains lists of the benefices and their taxations, of the four dioceses of the ecclesiastical province of Trèves, namely, Metropolitan Trèves, Metz, Toul, and Verdun.

CORRESPONDENCE.

NOTE ON THE OPENING WORDS OF THE ODYSSEY OF LIVIUS ANDRONICUS.

I chanced a few evenings ago to be looking through *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. XXXV, when my own name in a footnote (p. 17) caught my eye. It was in an article by Mr. Charles Knapp, and at this particular point, while crediting me with both 'good' and 'bad' comment on Livius Andronicus, he says I am 'dead' to two points which he mentions in connection with the first line of Livius' *Odyssey*, namely that in *Virum mihi, Camena, insece versutum*, the word *insece* is a good rendering of ἔννεπε and *versutum* of πολύτροπον. Mr. Knapp has curiously, but I am sure unintentionally, misread the quotation which he gives quite correctly from my *Literary History of Rome*. So far was I from failing to see the obvious appropriateness of these Latin words that I deliberately contrasted the faithfulness of Livius at his start with his loose renderings—whether we call them translation or paraphrase—at later points. My words were "The extant specimens prove that he can positively mistranslate, and that he does not maintain the fidelity of the familiar opening words:—*Virum mihi, Camena, insece versutum*"; and I added a footnote quoting the Greek ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον (*Lit. Hist. of Rome*, p. 124). Mr. Knapp must have understood the words to mean that Livius does not maintain fidelity to the opening words—a very different matter. I should like to assure him that I fully appreciate the danger of judging Livius too absolutely from fragments, and in fact gave a caution on "the customary difficulties in forming a critical judgment on an author represented by no one passage of length", and whose "surviving fragments do not amount to a hundred lines" (*Lit. Hist. of Rome*, p. 122). To my mind the great thing about Livius is his historical importance. Under that head I estimate him as highly as any other critic has done; and I very gladly agree with Mr. Knapp that Mommsen—always less convincing in literary than in historical pronouncements—was too severe in his arraignment of Andronicus's renderings and paraphrases.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

ARMSTRONG COLLEGE IN THE UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM,
NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE, ENGLAND.

My attention has been called to the fact that in A. J. P. XXXV 17, n. 3, I misinterpreted certain words which I quoted from Mr. J. W. Duff's book, *A Literary History of Rome*, 124. I refer to the words "he does not maintain the fidelity of the familiar opening words:—*Virum mihi, Camena, insece versutum*". I see now, what I should have seen before, that Mr. Duff meant to tell us that, in his judgment, Livius' opening line, in contrast to other lines by him, was a faithful rendering of the Greek. I am sorry that I failed to see this, particularly because I have a very high opinion of Mr. Duff's book. Yet I may say in self-defence that to insert as a subordinate element of a discussion of a man's inaccuracies (a discussion which covers 15 lines) a reference to one excellent and faithful rendering seems to me unfortunate. Had I caught Mr. Duff's true meaning I should of course have begun my note in a different way, but I am constrained to say that the main part of it, the part beginning "The number of fragments whose place is uncertain" would be unchanged. Our studies of early Latin literature will remain untrustworthy so long as we keep forgetting that even Archimedes needed a *πῶς στῶ*.

CHARLES KNAPP.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

Pröbuerunt.

I ask leave to protest against the statement on p. 410 (post-script) of the last number of the American Journal of Philology that "metrical stress . . . brought about the portentous 'probuerunt'", in my version of Professor Housman's 'Epitaph on an Army of Mercenaries' published in the Literary Supplement of the Times of Nov. 8, 1917.

In the line in question

rerum probuerunt ob aes ruinam

I originally wrote a different verb which I changed in order to give the Lucretian colour that seemed to suit the subject and the original. Of the two passages which I cited one (I 977) contains a form *probeat* = *prohibeat* which may be maintained to be due to 'metrical stress' and one (III 864) a form *probet* which cannot; for it is not to be supposed that Lucretius could not get *prohibet* into his verse. A more reasonable supposition is that *probeo* is a contraction of the same kind as *praebeo* and *debeo* and that the scansion *pröbu-ërunt* would not have seemed more 'portentous' to Lucretius than the scansion *prāebuërunt* seemed to Ovid, *Amores* I 14.

25, *Heroides* II 142. And what was good enough for Lucretius is good enough for me.

J. P. POSTGATE.

THE UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL, Feb. 21, 1918.

In curious accord with the spirit of the anonymous critic who accused me of a seven-footed hexameter (A. J. P. XXXV 234), Professor Postgate implies my ignorance of a familiar fact in Latin Prosody (G.-L. 131, 5; 722). The combination of the two liberties involved in the line which he defends seemed to me 'portentous' and both due to metrical stress, but if the Great War has robbed me of the 'iucunda senectus' for which I had hoped, it has not affected the 'mite ingenium' to which I lay claim and I apologize for the word 'portentous', an epithet which I forbore to apply to a flaw in classical research for which the future author of *Flaws in Classical Research* was responsible (A. J. P. IV 208 fn.).

B. L. G.

NECROLOGY.

JAMES RIGNALL WHEELER.

1859-1918.

In his *Histoire de la littérature grecque*, M. Maurice Croiset says of the ancient Greek: "L'Hellène a toujours eu de la raison dans l'imagination, de l'esprit dans le sentiment, de la réflexion dans la passion. Jamais on ne le voit entraîné totalement d'un seul côté. Il a, pour ainsi dire, plusieurs facultés prêtes pour chaque chose, et c'est en les associant qu'il donne à ses créations leur véritable caractère." In our modern world and especially in these troublous and passionate times this finely tempered rationality, the 'master-light of all our seeing,' appears the more desirable as our need of it is greater. Observing the harm done to worthy causes by ardent extremists, one has a quickened sense of the value in human intercourse of this equipoise of mind, this alert yet controlled idealism. Some such train of thought must have come to many in connection with the recent death, on February 9, of Professor James R. Wheeler. Not only did he inculcate unweariedly this liberal habit of mind;

he was in his daily life and conversation an example of the nature of its winning power. In an address delivered in 1907 at the opening exercises of the academic year at Columbia University he defined the idea of liberal education in words that to those who knew him seemed to be entirely applicable to his own personality: "It is a very old idea," he said, "and it is profoundly ethical in nature, having to do with what Aristotle has called a *ἔξις ψυχῆς*, a spiritual condition, which grows out of the direction and quality of our mental activity, and which determines our way of looking at things. The man who has fully grasped it will have soberness and righteousness and wisdom, and like that great poet of antiquity, he will 'see life steadily and see it whole'". This high serenity of spirit in which *sine ira et studio* Mr. Wheeler addressed himself to the complicated problems of scholarship and of administration had fruitful results in many forms of activity. He taught in succession at Johns Hopkins, Harvard, Vermont, and Columbia, and in the last named university not only gave instruction in Greek literature, art and archaeology, but was for five years, 1906-1911, dean of the faculty of fine arts. He served from 1894 to 1901 as secretary and since 1901 as chairman of the managing committee of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. In 1914 he became an alumni trustee of his Alma Mater, the University of Vermont, and in 1916 a member of the municipal art commission of New York City. He was associate editor of the American Journal of Archaeology, and in collaboration with Professor H. N. Fowler published in 1909 an admirable *Handbook of Greek Archaeology*. In all these activities the fineness of his scholarship and taste was readily discernible. These standards he held high and was uncompromising in their defence. But he commended his teaching of the Greek spirit most of all by expressing it in his own life with characteristic simplicity, humor, and unflinching courtesy.

NELSON G. MCCREA.

CORRIGENDUM.

In the last number of the Journal, p. 460, l. 5 from bottom, read G. Birckbeck Hill.

C. W. E. M.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. G. E. Stechert & Co., 151-155 W. 25th St., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN AND ENGLISH.

American Academy in Rome. *Memoirs of the academy.* V. I, Sch. 1 of Classical Studies 1915-16. New York, *The Academy* (101 Park Ave.), 1917. 172 pp. il. pls. facsms. fig. fol. bds. \$5.

Browne (Rev. H. J.) *Our renaissance; essays on the reform and revival of classical studies; with a preface by Sir Frederic Kenyon.* New York, *Longmans.* 16 + 281 pp. 8°. \$2.60 net.

Butler (Leo T.) *Exercises in Latin versification.* Boston, *Allyn & Bacon*, 1917. 7 + 149 pp. 12°. 75 c.

Constans (Léopold). *Chrestomathie de l'ancien français (IX^e-XV^e siècles); précédée d'un tableau sommaire de la littérature française au moyen âge; suivie d'un glossaire étymologique détaillé; ouvrage couronné par l'Académie Française. Troisième édition soigneusement revue.* New York, *G. E. Stechert.* 244 pp. 8°. \$2 net.

Cooper (Lane). *Greek Genius and Its Influence; select essays and extracts; with an introd.* New Haven, Ct., *Yale University.* 350 pp. 8°. \$3.50 net.

D'Alton (J. F.) *Horace and his Age; a study in historical background.* New York, *Longmans.* 12 + 296 pp. 12°. \$2 net.

Fowler (W. Warde). *Aeneas at the Site of Rome. Observations on the eighth book of the Aeneid.* New York, *Longmans.* 9 + 128 pp. 12°. \$1.50 net.

Glover (Terrot Reaveley). *From Pericles to Philip.* New York, *Macmillan.* 11 + 405 pp. 8°. \$3 net.

Grandgent (C. Hall). *The Ladies of Dante's Lyrics.* Cambridge, Mass., *Harvard University.* 181 pp. 8°. \$1.35 net.

Greek Anthology (The). With English trans. by W. R. Paton. (In 5 vols.) Vol. 3. 18°. 256 pp. (Loeb Classical lib.) *Heinemann*, 1917. 5s. net; lthr. 6s. 6d. net.

Guthrie (K. S.) *Numenius of Apamea, the Father of Neo-Platonism: Works, Biography, Message, Sources and Influence.* 8°. 219 pp. *Lusac*, 1917. 5s.

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. V. XXVIII. Cambridge, Mass., *Harvard University*, 1917. 8°. bds. \$1.50 net.

Horace (Quintus Horatius Flaccus). *The Odes and Secular Hymn of Horace. Englished into rimed verse corresponding to the original meters by Warren H. Cudworth.* New York, *A. A. Knopf.* 20 + 161 pp. 12°. \$1.50 net.

Mackenzie (Donald A.) *Myths of Crete and Pre-Hellenic Europe.* 415 pp. 8°. *Gresham Pub. Co.*, 1917. 10s. net.

Mainwaring (C. I.) and Paine (W. I.) *Secundus annus. Cr.* 8°. 102 pp. (Direct method: *Lingua Latina.*) *Milford*, 1917. 2s. 6d.

More (Paul Elmer). *Platonism. Lectures delivered at Princeton University, October 29, 30, 31, November 6, 7, 1917.* Princeton, N. J.,

Princeton University Press. 11 + 307 pp. diagr. 8°. (Louis Clark Vanuxem Foundation lectures for 1917-1918). \$1.75 net.

Petrie (W. M. Flinders). Scarabs and Cylinders. With names illustrated by the Egyptian collection in University College, London. Fol. 73 pl. and text (Brit. Sch. of Archaeology in Egypt). *Constable*, 1917. 30s. net.

— Tools and Weapons. Illus. by the Egyptian collection in University College, London, &c. Fol. 80 pl. and text (Brit. Sch. of Archaeology in Egypt). *Constable*, 1917. 35s. net.

Plautus. With English trans. by Paul Nixon (in 5 vols.). Vol. 2. 18°. 510 pp. (Loeb Classical Lib.) *Heinemann*, 1917. 5s. net; lthr. 6s. 6d. net.

Potter (Murray Anthony). Four essays. Cambridge, Mass., *Harvard University*. 139 pp. 8°. (Harvard Studies in Romance Languages.) \$1.25 net.

Pythagoras. The Golden verses of Pythagoras. Tr. by Fabre d'Olivet. Done into English by Nayan Louise Redfield. 8°. *Putnam*, 1917. 15s. net.

Sherman (C. Phineas). Roman Law in the Modern World. 3 v. Boston, *Boston Book Co.*, 83 Francis St., Roxbury, 1917. 8°. \$13.

Sturtevant (Edg. Howard). Linguistic Change. An introduction to the historical study of language. Chicago, *University of Chicago*. 10 + 185 pp. il. figs. 12°. \$1 net.

Taylor (Alfr. E.) Plato's Biography of Socrates. New York, *Oxford University Press*. 40 pp. 8°. (British Academy pubs.) pap. \$1.

FRENCH.

Alaux. Les Leçons d'espagnol. (Cours supérieur.) 4 parts in 1 volume. *Garnier*, 1917. 3 fr. 60.

Amato (Modesto). Ce que le manifeste de la Pléiade doit à l'Italie. Palermo, *A. Trimarchi*, 1917. 95 pp.

— La grammaire de Montaigne. Palermo, *Trimarchi*, 1917. 82 pp.

Bloch (Oscar). Les Parlers des Vosges méridionales (arrondissement de Remiremont). Étude de dialectologie. 290 pp. *Champion*, 1917. 12 fr.

— Lexique français-patois des Vosges méridionales. 186 pp. *Champion*, 1917. 27 fr.

Brunot (F.) Histoire de la langue française des origines à 1900. Tome V. Le Français en France et hors la France au XVII^e siècle. VIII + 444 pp. *Colin*, 1917. 15 fr.

Delcourt (René). Expressions d'argot allemand et autrichien dans les tranchées. *E. de Boccard*, 1917. 4 fr. 80.

Klionoff (Olga). Correspondance commerciale et mondaine russe à l'usage des Français (L. Rodstein), 1917. 6 fr. 60.

Lourtau (P.) Curso de español comercial; prologo de A. Abenza. 320 pp. *Colin*, 1917. boards. 3 fr. 60.

Maspéro (Gaston). Introduction à l'étude de la phonétique égyptienne. 138 pp. *Champion*, 1917. 18 fr.

Parrel (G. de). Précis d'anacousie vocale et de labiologie. Méthode orale d'éducation auditive, d'initiation phonétique et de lecture sur les lèvres. *Maloine*, 1917. 12 fr.

Pernot (Hubert). Grammaire de grec moderne, langue parlée. *Garnier*, 1917. boards. 6 fr.

Schweitzer et Simonnot. La Méthodologie des langues vivantes. *Colin*, 1917. 4 fr.

Tanqueray (F. J.) *L'Évolution du verbe anglo-français, XIII^e et XIV^e siècles.* (222nd fascicle of the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études.*) *Champion*, 1917. 870 pp. 30 fr.

Vocabulaire bulgare-français. *Garner*, 1917. 456 pp. boards, 2 fr. 40.

ITALIAN.

Dati (Carlo). *Le Origini italiane del Menagio e l'Etimologico toscano degli Accademici della Crusca; undici lettere inedite ad Alessandro Segni (1665-1666) per Ferdinando Massai.* (Extracted from *Rivista delle biblioteche e degli archivi.*) Firenze, tip. *E. Ariani*, 1917. 22 pp.

D'Ovidio (Francesco). *Del sostantivo stipa in Dante e d'una ignota forma congiuntivale del bolognese antico.* (Extracted from *Atti della r. accademia di archeologia, lettere e belle arti.*) Napoli, tip. *Cimmaruta*, 1917. 23 pp.

Lacalendola (Adamo). *Frasi militari usuali, seguite da 1400 vocaboli scelti, usatissimi nella conversazione e nei giornali albanesi moderni: avviamento allo studio dell'albanese toscano usato nell'Albania meridionale, ad uso degli studenti del r. istituto superiore di studi commerciali in Bari.* Tip. *F. Casini e figlio*, 1917. 32 pp.

Lovera (Romeo). *Grammatica della lingua romena, coll'aggiunta di modelli di lettere e di un vocabolario delle voci più usuali. Terza edizione corretta ed ampliata.* Milano, *U. Hoepli*, 1917. 211 pp. bound Lire 2.50.

Scherillo (Michele). *L'opera buffa napoletana durante il settecento.* Palermo, *Sandron*, 1917. Lire 7.

SPANISH.

Dos romances anónimos del siglo XVI. *El sueño de Feliciano de Silva. La muerte de Héctor.* Publicados con una introducción y con sus fuentes. H. Thomas. 1 vol. 1917. 86 págs. Pes. 2.

Enciclopedia Universal ilustrada europeo-americana. Etimologías sánscrito, hebreo, griego, latín, árabe, lenguas indígenas americanas, etc. tomo XXXIV. Med.-M^odcz; 1 vil. de 1512 págs. con grabados. tela. Pes. 28.50.

Masriera Colomer (Arturo). *Diccionario de Dictionarios castellano, latino, portugués, francés, italiano, catalán, inglés y alemán. Comprensivo del léxico castellano considerablemente aumentado, con su correspondencia en cada uno de los siete idiomas mencionados, y de un vocabulario-resumen de todas las voces extranjeras contenidas en el Diccionario, seguidas de su significación castellana.* 4 vols. tela. Pes. 86.

Miranda Podadera (Luis). *Tratado de ortografía, acentuación y análisis sintáxico.* 42 páginas. Pes. 1.50.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Biblical Archaeology, The Society of. Proceedings. Vol. XXXIX. Parts 6 and 7. London, *The Offices of the Society*, 1917.

Bloomfield (Leonard). Tagalog texts with grammatical analysis. Urbana, *Published by the University of Illinois*, 1917. Part I: Texts and translation. \$1.50. Part II: Grammatical analysis. \$3. Part III: List of formations and glossary. \$1.50. (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature. Vol. III, Nos. 2, 3 and 4.)

Carnahan (David Hobart). The Ad Deum Vadit of Jean Gerson. Urbana, *Published by the University of Illinois*, 1917. (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature. Vol. III, No. 1.) \$1.75.

Carpenter (Rhys). The Ethics of Euripides. (Archives of Philosophy, No. 7, May, 1916.) New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1916.

Cooper (John M.) Analytical and critical bibliography of the tribes of Tierra del Fuego and adjacent territory. (Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 63.) Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1917.

Cory (H. E.) Edmund Spenser. A Critical Study. (University of California Publications in Modern Philology. Vol. 5, pp. 1-478.) Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1917.

Jewish Quarterly Review, The. New series. Vol. VIII. No. 3, January, 1918. Philadelphia, Pa., published quarterly by the Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 1918.

Journal of the American Oriental Society. Vol. 35, part IV. December, 1917. New Haven, Conn., *The American Oriental Society*, 1917.

Literature. Vol. III. No. 3 and 4. (August and November, 1917.)

Lofberg (John Oscar). Sycophancy in Athens. (University of Chicago diss.) Chicago, Ill., 1917.

Lucretius. Edited by William A. Merrill. Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1917. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 4.)

McLemore (James S.) The tradition of the Latin accent. (University of Virginia diss.) *University of Virginia*, 1917.

Meyer (Kuno). Miscellanea Hibernica. Urbana, *Published by the University of Illinois*, 1917. (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature. Vol. II, No. 4.) \$1.

More (Paul Elmer). Platonism. *Princeton University Press*, 1917. \$1.75.

Mustard (Wilfred P.) The Eclogues of Faustus Andrelinus and Ioannes Arnolletus. Baltimore, *The Johns Hopkins Press*, 1918.

Nutting (H. C.) Caesar's Use of Past Tenses in Cum-Clauses. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 1-53, Feb. 9, 1918.) Berkeley, *University of California Press*.

Palmer (Walter H.) Anaphora: Its Origin and Use. Reprinted from Washington University Studies, Vol. 5. Humanistic Series, No. 1, 1917.

Palmgren (F.) Studier och utkast till fransk ljud- och uttalslära. Vänersborg, *Vänersborgs Boktryckeri*, 1916.

Quarter-Centennial Publications (The) of the University of Chicago. Publications of the Members of the University, 1902-1916. Chicago, Ill., *University of Chicago Press*, 1917.

Radin (Max). Roman Knowledge of Jewish Literature. *Classical Journal* XIII 3, December, 1917.

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Universidad de la Habana. Vol. XXV. Núm 2. Septiembre y Octubre de 1917.

Schoff (Wilfred H.) The Eastern Iron Trade of the Roman Empire. (Reprinted from the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 35, Part III, December, 1915.)

Shakespeare. Yale Edition. The Tragedy of Othello. Ed. by Lawrence Mason. 50 c. The Winter's Tale. Ed. by Frederick E. Pierce. 50 c. New Haven, *Yale University Press*; London, *Humphrey Milford*, 1917.

Smith (Kirby Flower). Martial, the Epigrammatist. Reprinted from *The Sewanee Review*, January, 1918.

Studies in Philology, Vol. XIII, No. 1. January, 1916. *University of North Carolina*, Chapel Hill, N. C.

Vanoverbergh (Morice). A grammar of Lepanto Igorot as it is spoken at Bauco. (Bureau of Science, Division of Ethnology Publications, Vol. V, Part VI.) Manila, *Bureau of Printing*, 1917.

Wilkins (Eliza Gregory). "Know Thyself" in Greek and Latin Literature. (University of Chicago diss.) Chicago, Ill., 1917.